

The Doctrine of the Unity and Uniformity
of Christ's Surety-righteousness, in the Im-
putation thereof to Believers in its infinite
Value,

V I E W E D

4255.aaa.21.

In the Light of divine Revelation, and in that of
our subordinate Standards of Orthodoxy ;

AND VINDICATED :

In opposition to the Scope of another Gospel, taught in
a late Catechism, intitled, *An Help to the Ignorant*,
(upon the Head of Justification), by John Brown,
V. D. M. and in *A brief Dissertation on Christ's Right-
eousness*, shewing in what Extent and proportion it is
imputed in Justification, by the same Author.

By JOHN DALZIEL,

Minister of the Gospel in the Associate Congregation
at EARLSTON.

1 Cor. i. 13. *Is Christ divided ?*

Phil. ii. 8. — *And became obedient unto death, even the death of
the cross.*

Rom. iii. 22. *Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of
Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe.*

EDINBURGH:

Printed for THOMAS FAMILTON and THOMAS
WILSON in Earlston, and sold by them, and by
the Booksellers in Town and Country.

MDCCLX.

[Price Five Pence.]

Inscrutability in overruling judgements
is a Morat evil and Charge by God upon
his people in the Day of trouble



1830
Lucan
Sept

P R E F A C E.

IF what is humbly offered in the following sheets, shall be found a seasonable caveat to guard the professors of Christianity against a manifest corruption in doctrine; or, if what is suggested therein shall prove a suitable antidote to check the baleful influence of the old leaven of an egregious mistake, upon the doctrine of *imputed righteousness*, the end is sufficiently gained. In treating upon this great and evangelical subject, I have endeavoured to state and vindicate a doctrine of such dignity and importance in revealed religion, that the genuine faith of the gospel, about the imputation of our Lord's active obedience, must stand or fall with it. I have no manner of doubt, but the arguments I have used, and others that might be urged, might have been prosecuted to far greater advantage by some abler hand; but this, however, I may venture to affirm, that the cause is the Lord's; whatever disadvantages it may sustain as to the point of managing the argument.

I confess it is, with me, a received principle, supported by the evidence of divine revelation, That if the surety-obedience of Jesus Christ be not imputed in its infinite value, it is not imputed at all. I am the more convinced of this, as the chimerical and frivolous objections of Cardinal Bellarmine and John Goodwin against the imputation of Christ's surety-righteousness *altogether*, have been lately mustered up against the imputation of his surety-obedience in its *infinite value*: and were these two

infamous writers cotemporary with John Brown, V. D. M. they would readily pay him their compliments, some way thus, *If you had not ploughed with our beifer, you had not found out our riddle.*

I must say, it is scarce worth while to resent that part of the ungenerous opposition which is made by him, in the first and second edition of his *Dissertation*, to the received doctrine aforementioned. He scruples not to lampoon it as an Antinomian and Familistic error; and to carry the brand of infamy a little higher, he reviles it as an old Antinomian and Familistic blasphemy. The only treatment that such bold flings of scandal merit, is to let them expire under their own shame. As to the unsuccessful attack which is pretended to be levelled by him against the imputation of Christ's surety-obedience in its infinite value, from the extent of the demand of law-precept as a covenant; he must be told, that the point taken for granted by him, in the objection upon which the slender force of it depends, can by no means be allowed him. It is certainly a most capital blunder, which must disconcert his plan, and render his whole scheme most apparently absurd, to confound the perfect obedience required, by law-precept as standing, of the first man, *of the earth earthy*, with the perfect obedience of the second man, *the Lord from heaven*, required, by law-precept as broken, in order to man's recovery. That the law, as a broken covenant, only required a perfect finite obedience of the Lord from heaven, which was not competent for him to give, is such a wild and arbitrary notion, as runs counter to both law and gospel, to reason and religion; an assertion quite indefensible,

defensible, and therefore ought to be given up with.

As to his doctrine of different proportions of value in our Lord's surety-righteousness, it is an insufferable paradox obtruded upon the world, a chimerical notion, that can tend to nothing more than to expose the author of it, and heighten the absurdity of the indefensible scheme it is brought to support.

Farther, as to his strained inference from the received doctrine, viz. "That if Christ's surety-
"obedience be imputed to believers in its in-
"finite value, then they are, in law-reckoning,
"strict and infinite meriters of their own salva-
"tion, infinitely righteous, comely, and ami-
"able;" the fallacy of it is easily detected, by observing, that the imputation of Christ's surety-obedience to us in its infinite value, neither imports a *transferring* of it away from himself, nor a *transfusing* of it into us; and therefore he must be obliged to evacuate all his pretended reasoning from this topic, and to let the stress of his darling opinion, which rests upon the false consequence, subside. His concession, that the *passive* obedience of Christ is imputed to believers in its infinite value, is a sufficient refutation of his foregoing inference from the imputation of Christ's *active* obedience in its infinite value: for how he will render the consequence valid, that believers, in law-reckoning, are made *infinitely righteous* by the one, and yet get it refused, according to his own hypothesis, that they are made *infinite saviours* and *redeemers*, by the other, is impossible to understand. Thus his very concession is an uncontroverted document, that his preposterous inference proves too much; and so, in reality, can prove nothing; and con-

frequently ought to be rejected, according to the known rules of reasoning.

It is not mere general protestations, that there is an uniformity and consistence of sentiment in this doctrine, that will counterbalance real and positive evidences to the contrary. The new schemist then must either retract his concession as to the imputation of Christ's passive obedience in its infinite value, or deliver up his forced inference from the imputation of Christ's active obedience in its infinite value: but though to retract the former, would be impious; yet to abandon the latter, would be his duty.

The author deserves little or no attention in the second edition of his *Dissertation*; neither will the intended brevity of the preface permit me to animadvert at any length upon the few additional novelties therein. I had almost finished all that I intended in answer to the first, before the second edition came to hand. Though, in the title-page of the second edition, it is said to be "much enlarged;" yet, upon a survey, it will be found, that the most of the enlargements might be crowded into the compass of a few alterations as to diction, and a few pretended criticisms and amendments. Such a floating, rolling, shifting thing is error, that it keeps wheeling around, carrying on the same design through all forms and shapes. For example, the second edition varies from the first, in adjusting and settling the main point, p. 6. Thus in Mr Brown's view, "our Lord's surety-righteousness" "may be considered, either as it is formally the" "righteousness of a God-man, or as it is formally a" "righteousness simply considered:" but this view of Christ's surety-righteousness is but to *darken counsel*

sel by words without knowledge; it is but uttering things that we know not, things too wonderful for us, that we understand not. That there is a necessary distinction betwixt the *essential* and *mediatory* righteousness of the Son of God, is evident; though the confounding of these two seems to be the ground-work of his new erection; but the foregoing distinction is but the sally of a vain fancy.

But farther, to avoid the glaring impropriety of the groundless distinction of an internal cause of justification, Mr Brown, in his second edition, has added a kind of salvo, by pretending, that Christ's righteousness in justification is an *internal cause*, or *ingredient*, p. 8. This increases the blunder to a remarkable height; and, instead of softening the crooked nature and asperity of the distinction, makes it seven times more crude and indigested: for it would make Christ's surety-righteousness, which is the ground of our justification before, and acceptance with God, only an ingredient therein. See! to what wretched shifts and expedients they must indeed have recourse, who refuse to acknowledge the imputation of Christ's surety obedience to believers in its infinite value.

Again, Mr Brown will find it a very graveling difficulty to purge his writings of contradictions, upon the point in dispute, to the conviction of intelligent and unprejudiced readers. Thus, by collating two or three passages, we shall see him caught in his own thickets, if not inextricably embarrassed, if he shall not retract his cardinal mistake. In his Catechism he denies point-blank, that the active obedience of Christ is imputed in its infinite value. In the first edition of his Dissertation,

p. 12. there is not such appearance of rigidity in his denial of the foregoing truth; his position is, "That the active obedience of Christ cannot be imputed to us" (he says not in its infinite value, but) "in that infinite value it hath as abiding in him." This, at least, looks something like a concession in him, that can distinguish in an infinite value; though indeed he may possibly refuse it, to serve his cause. But however this may be, I am confident, that in the second edition of the *Dissertation*, p. 18. he delivers up the main fort, as it were by capitulation. "Why," says he, "it is also readily granted, that our justification in Christ is circumstantially more glorious than what we could have obtained in Adam, in regard we are therein constituted perfectly righteous in law, through the imputation of a righteousness subjectively infinite, and fulfilling both precept and penalty; instead of being clothed with the righteousness of a mere creature, respecting only the precept."

Now, reader, here is the imputation of a righteousness subjectively infinite granted; it might have been rather more proper to have styled it a righteousness of infinite value, as it was wrought out in our Lord's human nature: here we are said to be clothed with it, instead of a perfect finite righteousness; here we are declared to be constituted perfectly righteous in law, through it. *N. B.* He says not, infinitely righteous in law, infinitely comely, and infinitely amiable; which words of truth and soberness are such a liberal concession, as evidently carry in them a surrender of the whole cause, unless they were to be understood in a sense quite contrary to the common use of the words themselves.

Mr Brown, in the preface to his *Dissertation*, is extremely offended at the opposers of his new doctrine, whom he calls a few. Upon these he throws out the opprobrious epithets of Antinomians and Familists, and gives them a broadside in a charge of ignorance, and but of "small acquaintance with "the writings of Protestant divines;" and to aggravate the pretended scandal, their conduct must be reckoned "an wounding of truth, a dishonouring "of Christ, an instructing of their people to revile, "and, in the issue, an injuring of their own reputation among impartial men." These may be justly styled ill-natured, not to say rancorous reflections. If Mr Brown intends to use this sort of artillery, he may be very sure, that the victory is lost; for that is always the last refuge of a baffled enemy, he goes off the field running and railing.

Moreover, one cannot but observe, what a liberal encomium he bestows upon his own productions, in viewing them from his own eminence, as "restoring to the scriptures, and the most eminent Protestant divines, their due honour of being "his instructors." It is true, he calls his *Dissertation* *weak endeavours*: But to speak of restoring the scriptures their due honour, is such a decoration and embellishment, as; perhaps, few will chuse to take to themselves the honour of.

In fine, it is proper to advertise Mr Brown, that, in the following sheets, no deductions are made from his doctrine, but what, it is presumed, the premisses will evidently bear: and when consequences from mens principles are just, native, and unavoidable, they ought at least to be remonstrated against, as if they were in express terms adopted by them. I am not sensible, that I have exaggerated matters in any part of the subsequent performance,

ance, or used any more vehement expressions than were suited to the objects before me. If a just and necessary concern for the great doctrines of the gospel shall draw upon me the censures or resentments of those who are for new-modelling the article of imputed righteousness, I hope I shall not be destitute of some of those considerations which are necessary to support me under them.

It may be easily apprehended, that I was necessitated, in the third section, in answering Mr Brown's queries, to recapitulate several thoughts hinted in the first and second, because of the co-incidence of the queries with his pretended arguments. Notwithstanding, it is hoped, that the truth contended for is farther cleared and confirmed, in the said answers.

If Mr Brown shall adventure to publish an answer in defence of his new error, it is highly probable, that, in a short time, a swatch of the mistakes and peculiarities interspersed through his Catechism may be offered him; which will readily put him upon a more arduous task than he is aware of.

It may be also proper to append a notification, that if any of Mr Brown's fathers or brethren have lent his new doctrine a lift from the chair of verity, it may be hoped, that, in process of time, they will take the following advice, tendered by one of the ancients, viz. "Never blush to change thy opinion; for neither you, nor I, nor any person alive, are of so great authority, as to be ashamed to confess we have erred."

I have this favour to ask of the intelligent reader, that he would carefully peruse the whole, before he passes his judgment on what I now submit to his consideration, and humbly leave in the hand of Providence.

The Doctrine of the Unity and Uniformity of
the Righteousness of Christ, in the Impu-
tation thereof to Believers in its infinite Va-
lue, considered and vindicated.

THE doctrine of *justification by faith,*
through the imputed righteousness of Christ,
shines with eminent splendor and per-
spicuity, in the light of supernatural
revelation. The light of nature was never cal-
culated for giving the smallest notice or intelli-
gence concerning this important doctrine and pri-
vilege. It is the shining and embellished character
thereof, that it belongs to the covenant of rich and
sovereign grace, which is most beautifully opened
and unfolded in the sacred oracles. Thus, as it is
wholly a doctrine and privilege of divine revela-
tion; so the glorious sovereignty of divine love
and grace, to law-condemned criminals, is illustri-
ously displayed therein. As a gracious benefit and
privilege purchased by the blood of Christ, it is a-
mong the first links of the great chain of spiritual
blessings belonging to the new covenant; as
an article in the plan and system of gospel-
doctrine, it is most evidently interesting, while
the several doctrines of the Christian faith are,
more or less, intimately connected with it. More-
over, such is its dignity and station in the Chri-
stian system, that if it is misconstrued or per-
verted, the consequence thereof, must at least en-
danger orthodoxy, as to several other articles in
the chain of gospel-truth. It is an uncontested

fact, that the church of Christ, in her several periods has, all along, looked upon the doctrine of imputed righteousness as one of the most peculiar and important branches of the doctrine of Christianity. Hence it was a received maxim of the famous reformer Luther, *Justificatio est articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiæ*. Where the doctrine of justification is maintained in a church, from the holy scriptures, in its orthodoxy and purity, it must be so far a leading evidence of her conformity to divine revelation upon the head of doctrine : But if a church representative become heterodox upon the doctrine of justification, it is an evidence of her corruption and degeneracy, and may afford ground to suspect her orthodoxy upon several other branches of gospel-truth. It cannot escape observation, with what convincing evidence and demonstration this article of the Christian faith is confirmed and established in the apostolic writings, particularly in the epistles to the Romans and the Galatians. In the doctrinal part of these valuable epistles, the doctrine of justification is most copiously displayed, and the objections of the adversary judiciously refuted. We ought therefore to be well established in this great truth, in order to our stability and confirmation in the faith of Christ. It is beyond controversy our singular mercy, that we enjoy standards of orthodoxy, drawn from the pure fountain of God's word ; wherein the doctrines of the everlasting gospel are judiciously stated, and represented in their scriptural connection and dependence : To the profession and maintenance of which reformation-standards, we in these lands stand bound
and

and obliged by the solemn oath and covenant of the most high God. Among other articles of gospel-truth beautifully displayed, and clearly stated, from the holy scriptures, in these excellent composures, the doctrine of justification by faith, through the imputed righteousness of Christ, bears a very peculiar figure; and is clearly taught, and distinctly treated, both in our confession of faith, and larger and shorter catechisms. Moreover, it is worthy of observation, by every reader, what an united and beautiful harmony subsists in these excellent standards of doctrine, upon this, as upon the several other articles of the Christian faith. Let it suffice us, at present, to quote that comprehensive summary of justification given in our lesser catechism, (in which the principles of our holy religion are drawn up with such remarkable conciseness and perspicuity, as, I think, was never yet exceeded; and which has been justly admired as a most judicious and valuable compend of gospel-truth). *Quest.* 33. "What is justification?"

Ans. "Justification is an act of God's free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and received by faith alone." In an explication of the shorter catechism, lately published, under the title of *An help to the ignorant*, the author, in treating upon the foregoing question, and particularly upon the doctrine of imputed righteousness, proposes, among others, the following questions and answers, p. 169. *Quest.* "Doth this imputation make us every way as righteous as Christ?" *Ans.* "No; for it is imputed only in proportion to our need."

Quest. "What need have we of the imputation of
C 2 "Christ's

"Christ's passive obedience?" *Ans.* "As a security
"from eternal wrath." *Quest.* "In what propor-

"tion is this imputed?" *Ans.* "In the infinite va-
"lue thereof." *Quest.* "Why so?" *Ans.* "Because

"our debt to justice and desert of wrath is infinite-
"ly great." *Quest.* "What need is there of the

"imputation of Christ's active obedience?" *Ans.*
"To found our title to eternal life," *Quest.* "Is

"this imputed in its infinite value?" *Ans.* "No."
Quest. "Why so?" *Ans.* "Because the law demands

"from us no more than perfect finite obedience."
Quest. "Why then did Christ perform an infinite-

"ly valuable active obedience?" *Ans.* "That pro-
"ceeded from the infinite dignity of his person,

"and not from his surety-engagement." *Quest.*
"Why then might not a finite person been surety?"

Ans. "Because he could not have given infinite sa-
"tisfaction." In the scheme of doctrine here taught

and published, upon the article of imputed righ-
teousness, we are taught to believe, that our Lord's

surety-righteousness in justification (which is com-
monly distinguished into his active and passive obe-

dience) is partly imputed in its infinite value, and
partly in a finite value; or, the passive obedience of

Christ is imputed to us in its infinite value, and
his active obedience only under a certain propor-

tion, as the teacher will have it. It is indeed im-
possible to understand what is intended by the pro-

portion in which our Lord's active obedience is im-
puted; if it is not to be constructed as only impu-

ted to us, under the sphere and capacity of a per-
fect finite obedience, and so as an obedience of a

finite value. It is impossible to affix any other con-
struction and explication to the doctrine as thus

laid and expressed by the teacher, without doing
him

him manifest injustice: for there is no medium betwixt finite and infinite; betwixt a righteousness of infinite value, and a righteousness of finite value. But whether the infinite value can be separated from our Lord's active obedience in justification, any more than from his passive; or whether the active obedience of Christ can be viewed as imputed under any such proportion, shall be afterwards inquired into. In the mean time, if language will bear any determinate sense and meaning, it can be no strained consequence from the scheme of doctrine as laid in the foregoing questions and answers, to infer, that our Lord's surety-righteousness, in the act of justification, is divided, in the imputation thereof to the members of his body-mystical; the passive obedience of Christ is placed to our account, is ours in the divine estimation, in the infinite value of it; but the active obedience of Christ is judicially reckoned to us, only under the capacity and proportion of a finite value. It is true indeed, to do the teacher all manner of justice, he pretends to account for this new mode of imputation, from the demands of a broken covenant upon sinners of mankind: but we shall see anon that these righteous demands, when duly considered, lay no manner of foundation for dividing our Lord's surety-righteousness, in the imputation thereof to his members, and for separating what is inseparable, namely, the infinite value from our Lord's active obedience. But, in direct contradiction to the genuine amount of the foregoing doctrine, about the peculiar manner of imputing our Lord's surety-righteousness, the teacher expressly affirms, in an answer to a following question, at the foot of the page already quoted, "That Christ's active and
" passive

“passive obedience are not separately imputed; but
 “both are imputed together, as one simple righteousness.” Surprising and astonishing! Can there be a more glaring contradiction found in a system of catechetical doctrine within less than the compass of a page? our Lord’s active and passive obedience, not separately, but jointly imputed, as one simple righteousness; and yet, according to the teacher, the passive obedience of Christ is imputed, in justification, in its infinite value, but the active only under the capacity and proportion of a perfect finite obedience. If this doctrine, when complexly examined, is not found flatly inconsistent with and contradictory to itself, human understanding must be at no small loss to form distinct and suitable ideas concerning contradictory propositions.

But, moreover, to render this novel doctrine about the peculiar manner in which our Lord’s surety-righteousness is imputed in justification current, the teacher has lately emitted to the world, “A
 “brief Dissertation on Christ’s righteousness, shewing, in what extent and proportion it is imputed
 “to us in justification.” Some cannot help thinking, that the title of this performance is not a little strange and striking, and favours of a new undertaking, to introduce a quite new gospel, upon the doctrine of imputed righteousness: for, in consequence of their having, in some measure, considered the sacred writings, and perused our subordinate standards of doctrine, and some of the polemical writings upon the doctrine of justification, they apprehend this to be a most unwarrantable undertaking, which, in the consequences thereof, must be extremely pernicious. Did ever any of the confessions of the reformed churches pretend to
 define,

define, in what extent, degree, and proportion, an indivisible righteousness is imputed to us? If the question about the extent and proportion, in a righteousness of infinite value, is so very important as the author pretends, it is really astonishing, that it has never been, for ought I know, moved, far less judicially determined, in any subordinate standard of orthodoxy. It may be rationally thought beyond dispute, had the holy scriptures exhibited a sum of evidence, where the degree is ascertained, the limits specified, the extent and proportion settled, in a righteousness of infinite value, it could not have very readily escaped the judgment and understanding of the compilers of our excellent confession of faith, and larger and shorter catechisms. But, in our standards of doctrine, there is the most profound silence about cutting and carving in a robe of such intrinsic excellence and absolute perfection, as the righteousness of our glorious Redeemer is. The author's brief dissertation is, therefore, an unaccountable attempt to establish a new tenet, a new gospel; which has never been taught, for any thing that I know, in any orthodox confession of faith.

And in regard we are laid under solemn obligations by divine authority, bound by our ordination vows and engagements, and by the solemn oath and covenant of the most high God, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, I shall endeavour to evince, 1. That the pretended arguments offered by this teacher, are quite incapable to establish his new gospel. 2. That the glorious truth denied by him is very capable of a large compass of proof, both from scripture and reason, and from our excellent standards
of

of doctrine. 3. That the queries put by him can no way invalidate the doctrine impugned by him.

S E C T. I.

IT was proposed, in the first place, to evince, that the pretended arguments offered by this teacher, are quite incapable to establish his new gospel.

The principal query which is pretended to be resolved in his brief Dissertation, is thus proposed by him, p. 6. "Whether, in justification, the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us in its whole infinite value ; or only in proportion to our need, and the demands which the law as a broken covenant of works makes upon us?"

The intelligent and judicious reader will readily apprehend, that it is impossible to understand the state of this query, so as to reconcile it with the common principles of human understanding. The question is not, Whether, in justification, the righteousness of Christ be imputed to us in its infinite value ? but, Whether it be imputed to us in its whole infinite value, or only in proportion to our need ? A *whole infinite value*, is a phraseology extremely absurd, an idiom of language unintelligible to the rational understanding. This author is strangely in love with his new gospel, which he is resolved to have against all the rules of grammar and language. Is not a whole compounded of parts ? But such is not infinity, nor an infinite value, which is simple and uncompounded : to attempt a division of what is indivisible, must be an insuperable task. But to this surprising query, which the author proposes to resolve, he immediately

diately subjoins another state of the question, which, as laid by him, would seem to have been intended as an equivalent to the former : but the querist is widely mistaken, if he reckons it a question of the same import with the foregoing ; for it is a question evidently distinct, as will appear to the intelligent at first view. The question is, “ Whether, through the imputation of Christ’s righteousness, believers are sustained in law as infinitely righteous as the person of Christ God-man, or only as perfectly and completely righteous as the law of God requires they should be ? ” The state of this question is evidently in as great disguise, wrapped up in as thick a mist as the former ; taking a consequence for granted, which is denied point-blank, namely, that if the surety obedience of Christ is imputed to believers in its infinite value, then believers are sustained in law as infinitely righteous as the person of Christ God-man. To state a question in this form, is but a piece of unmanly fraud, sufficiently declarative of the conduct of the disputant, lurking and shuffling under strained consequences, and so frequently giving battle to his own imagination : but he has perhaps forgot himself, *p.* 14. in flatly denying, that the consequence will follow from the imputation of our Lord’s passive obedience in its infinite value to believers in their justification. “ Is it not manifest,” says he, “ that the imputation of Christ’s passive obedience in its infinite value doth not constitute us infinitely righteous in law ; but only legally innocent, or free from the law-charge, and guilt of our infinite crimes ? ” If this is a truth altogether obvious to this author’s understanding, as to the consequence from the im-

putation of Christ's *passive* obedience in its infinite value ; why is not the parallel consequence equally obvious to him, from the imputation of our Lord's *active* obedience in its infinite value ? namely, That thereby believers, in their justification, are constituted *perfectly* and *completely*, not *infinite-ly* righteous in law. Will not this teacher be as able to demonstrate, that the parallel lines in a geometrical figure, that stand perpendicularly upon the points or extremities of each other, are not equal, as prove the one consequence to be genuine, and the other strained ? But this will be farther animadverted upon in the sequel.

The author proceeds, at the foot of the 6th page, to declare his judgment upon the confused state of the question as proposed by him. " My fixed sentiments are," says he, " that the righteousness of Christ can by no means be imputed to us in its whole infinite value, so as to constitute us infinitely righteous in law, but only in proportion to our need, and to that debt which we owe to the broken law and offended justice of God."

His meaning is, that our Lord's surety-righteousness in justification is placed to our account, in part of its infinite value only. *Papæ !* this is certainly a *non-entity*. A *half infinite value*, a *whole infinite value*, are modes of speech pregnant with absurdity. Why, but this *non-entity* of a righteousness not of infinite value, but of half an infinite value, is conceived by him to be a very important truth, to be imputed to us, and to stand in an exact proportion to our need, and to that debt which we owe to the broken law and offended justice of God, p. 7. If these words of falsehood, which the teacher

teacher has conceived and uttered, are his fixed sentiment, it had been far better for him to have kept it *in retentis*. The dividing between our Lord's surety-righteousness in justification, and its infinite value, is very far from being a doctrine according to godliness, *Is Christ divided?* 1 Cor. i. 13; and is quite inconsistent with what is taught by this author in his Catechism, namely, That "Christ's active and passive obedience are not separately imputed; but both are imputed together, as one simple righteousness."

Further, in the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th pages, the writer pretends to collect a sufficient list of arguments to support and establish his separating and dividing doctrine about our Lord's surety-righteousness and its infinite value.

His first argument, which is pretended to be drawn from the nature of God's act in imputing a surety-righteousness to us, is no way conducive to support his untenible doctrine. It is, no doubt, matter of fact, an unexceptionable position, That when the great Jehovah imputes Christ's surety-righteousness to us, he accounts it ours in law. But what avails this consideration to the new doctrine the author pleads for? Instead of making for, in my humble opinion, it makes quite against his new article of Christianity; *For the judgment of God being always according to truth*, Rom. ii. 2: the perfect obedience and complete satisfaction of Christ, as the righteousness of God in our nature, is judicially estimated in law a complete answer to its precept and penalty, and so our very righteousness, obedience, and satisfaction, Rom. v. 17. 18. 19. Rom. x. 4. The question subjoined by this teacher, in summing up his argument, namely, "But how

“ can this righteousness be accounted or sustained
 “ as ours in law, in any other proportion than
 “ that of the just demands of the law of works
 “ upon us ? ” is a question of such pernicious consequence, that it is shrouded with gross darkness, if not with palpable error and mistake. The intelligent will observe at first view, that it evidently proceeds upon a measuring our Lord’s one, uniform, indivisible mediatory righteousness, by the rules of proportion, pretending that the holy law of the most high God is the criterion and standard of a certain proportion in Christ’s surety-righteousness which belongs to us, and of consequence, that there is a certain degree and proportion in that glorious robe which the holy law of God had no concern with, and which does not belong to us in justification. To this purpose is his surprising gloss upon Rom. x. 4. *For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth.* “ It “ is never insinuated,” says he, p. 9. “ that “ Christ is more than the end of the law for righteousness to believers : ” that is, according to his measuring and dividing doctrine, our Lord’s surety-righteousness is the fulfilling end of the law to believers in a certain proportion, and this certain proportion is exactly suited to their need ; but then there is a certain proportion in Christ’s surety-righteousness, in which it is more than the fulfilling end of the law ; and so, according to the teacher, it is only under the former, not under the latter degree, that it is imputed to believers. Reader, this is the author’s famous doctrine of proportion in a righteousness, which is absolutely uncompounded, and therefore uniform and indivisible : this is the new, the naked artifice which lies at the
 the

the root, runs through the whole, forms his scheme, and constitutes the proper frame of his Dissertation. But I might appeal from his performance to his understanding, if it is not somewhat similar to *the oppositions of science falsely so called*, which every professed Christian should avoid, 1 Tim. vi. 20.

If his second argument can be gathered, with much difficulty, from a heap of distinctions, it comes to hand, at last, in this odd shape, *viz.* That our Lord's mediatory righteousness is not imputed to believers as the *meritorious*, but as the *material* cause of their justification. It is more than probable, that the weak and uncautious may be led captive by such wrested and abused distinctions. It is truly a great pity but they understood the author's sense and application of them; which would certainly be the best antidote against imposition. According to his use and application of them, they must be understood thus: Our Lord's righteousness, as the *meritorious* cause of justification, is his righteousness in its whole infinite value. His own account of it is thus given by himself, p. 8. "This righteousness is the strictly meritorious cause of our justification, precisely as it is the righteousness of God in our nature." What this teacher means by the words *precisely* and *strictly*, in the describing of this distinction, is not easy to define, if the righteousness of Christ, in his view, is not capable of some other consideration, "than the righteousness of God in our nature;" and what is that other consideration it is capable of? Why, it is Christ's righteousness as the *material* cause of our justification; which, in this author's view, is not strictly and precisely the righteousness of

of God in our nature, but Christ's righteousness without its infinite value, or, at least, in part of its infinite value only ; and, under this capacity, according to this teacher, it is sustained in law as our very righteousness before God. Oh strange ! what a scene of confusion is this ! Here is nothing, but one wave of absurdity dashing against another. Can our glorious Redeemer's righteousness be rightly viewed and considered, by any mortal creature, from the holy scriptures, under any other capacity, than what it is really in itself, namely, a righteousness of infinite value ? Can it undergo any other consideration, as to its very being, than " the righteousness of God in our nature ? " Can its infinite value, in *part*, belong to it as the material cause of justification, and, in *whole*, to it as the meritorious cause of justification ? This is, indeed, cutting and carving in an infinite value, where there is no composition. But the author continues to distinguish, for the sake of his precise tenet : " Christ's righteousness," says he, " as " the meritorious cause, is an external cause " of justification ; but as the material cause, " is an internal cause of justification." What ! " an internal cause of justification ! " A new invention indeed, but utterly inconsistent with the scripture-doctrine of imputed righteousness. The very essence of the distinction makes void all imputation, and is utterly inconsistent with the nature of that spiritual benefit and privilege, as being an act of God's free grace *without* us. Christ's righteousness is indeed said to be *unto all, and upon all them that believe*, Rom. iii. 22. ; but no where is it to be said *in all*. A distinction of this kind is far more proper to the patrons of transubstantiation,

tion, which is folly to our senses, and blasphemy to our faith. As the council of Trent is quoted at the foot of the page, this teacher might be asked, If he has learned the distinction of an *internal* cause of justification, from that infamous convention? It is really an unfair method of dealing with the Protestant doctrine of justification, to sham us off with a new-coined artifice, an arbitrary fiction, which is plainly subversive of its very nature. But the author having reared this slender fortification for his own defence, pretends to argue against the imputation of Christ's righteousness as the meritorious cause of justification, and surprisingly asks, "How it can be imputed to us, who are mere creatures, mere men, as it is the righteousness of God in our nature?" p. 8. Such a query as this, is, in effect, a bold stroke at the doctrine of imputation altogether. This teacher must be told, that there is, no doubt, a very great mystery in the imputation of Christ's surety-righteousness to the criminal debtor; but that it is really imputed to us under the character and capacity of the righteousness of God in our nature, is beyond any rational contradiction; for it can be placed to our account under no other consideration than what it really is; but it is really the righteousness of God in our nature; and therefore is imputed to us as such. It is absolutely vain for this author, to argue against the imputation of it under this view, because, as such, it is meritorious before imputation, and is equally the meritorious cause of our regeneration, adoption, sanctification, and future glory. What then is the consequence? Can these considerations any way supersede the imputation of it to us, as it is the righteousness of God

God in our nature? This teacher must have a very penetrating apprehension that sees they can. But he has, perhaps, forgot himself, and therefore he should recollect, that he allows the imputation of the passive obedience of Christ in its infinite value, in justification; and therefore he must, nill he will be, grant it to be imputed as the righteousness of God in our nature, or as the meritorious cause of justification. This concession of his own must press him extremely hard, unless he should deny, that Christ's passive obedience, in its infinite value, is meritorious; and how would this divinity sound? What he suggests in favour of the imputation of our Lord's righteousness as a material cause, evaporates into smoke: for, according to him, Christ's righteousness as a material cause is not strictly and precisely the righteousness of God in our nature; the material cause therefore, in this view, is a non-entity, a mere nothing, namely, Christ's righteousness, wanting its infinite value, or, at least, wanting a part of it. But that Christ's righteousness, in justification, is imputed to us as the righteousness of God in our nature, is a precious truth that cannot be overthrown. Is not this surety righteousness the meritorious cause in law of the absolution of the criminal debtor? Is it not the legal ground and foundation upon which he is absolved? Is it not accounted his very payment, because the surety and he are one person in law? And moreover, is it not upon the ground and foundation of the righteousness imputed that his sins are pardoned, and his person pronounced righteous and accepted? Is it not upon this ground that he holds his title to the great charter of life? Wherefore, as a righteousness meri-

torious,

torious, it must be imputed. The consequence the author draws from this plain doctrine, is extremely foreign, namely, "that believers in law are then infinite meritors of their own justification and salvation." This consequence we absolutely disavow, as utterly inconclusive. The author and finisher of the surety-righteousness, our Lord Jesus, is one person, and the believing receiver another, in a *physical* sense; his surety-righteousness in justification, is not *infused*, but *imputed*; the genuine sense and meaning whereof is not, that we are reputed, esteemed, or accounted to have been the authors and finishers of the surety-righteousness; but that, in justification, it is placed to our account, judicially estimated ours, or reckoned upon our score. An insolvent debtor may just as well be said to purchase his own absolution, when his surety's payment is legally sustained in his favour, and the prison-door opened to him; than which nothing can be more improper and absurd. The author, having proved nothing, but confused every thing, concludes his second argument in this manner: "That the righteousness of Christ is not imputed to us in that extensive value which constitutes it the strictly meritorious cause of justification, but only in so far as it is the material cause thereof." An empty cavil indeed, if not something worse, which would divide the infinite value of our Lord's surety-righteousness between it as a meritorious and a material cause. But it must be remembered here, that if the infinite value of our Lord's surety-righteousness belong to it, either less or more, as a material cause, then as the material cause, according to this author, it is an internal cause of justification; and then, according

to this new doctrine, believers are infinite deities, infinite meriters of their own justification. Reader, behold! how his distinguishing genius has engulfed him at last in the very mire of absurdity, into which he was making an unsuccessful attempt to drag others.

In his third argument, he introduces some passages of scripture to establish his novel hypothesis, namely, That our Lord's mediatory righteousness, as it is the righteousness of God in our nature, is not imputed to us in justification: but none of the sacred passages quoted by him, evince any such thing. They indeed amount to an incontestable proof of that which we hope never to deny, namely, That our Lord's surety-righteousness is the fulfilling end of the law; and therefore it is imputed to us in justification, as containing a complete answer to the precept and penalty of the law of works. But what then? It is strenuously argued, that Christ's surety-righteousness, being the righteousness of God in our nature, it is that, and that alone, which exhibits a complete answer to the precept and penalty of the law of works. The consideration subjoined by him, from "the equal breadth and latitude of the mercy-seat with the ark," will never prove that our Lord's surety-obedience is not imputed in justification as the obedience of a divine person; it will never establish this strange turn of doctrine, that the passive obedience of Christ is imputed in justification in its infinite value, but his active obedience only under the capacity of a perfect finite obedience. Nay, as this doctrine is void of any regularity, order, and connection, the very example adduced by him is a sufficient proof, that it is, like the
legs

legs of the lame, not equal ; and that therefore Christ's surety-righteousness (being the righteousness of God in our nature) is the fulfilling end of the law, and exactly answers all its requirements ; his unspotted nature, to the holiness and spirituality of it ; his righteous life, to all the obedience it commands, and his sufferings and death, to the penalty it enjoins. This being the plain import of the instance quoted, is sufficient to overturn the unequal and crooked doctrine taught by this author : and, without controversy, he is never better served, than when he is confronted with his own weapons.

His fourth argument is pretended to be deduced from the suretyship of Christ, wherein he is very painful and assiduous in displaying his refinements to reconcile us to a certain degree and proportion in our Lord's mediatory righteousness ; such as his distinguishing between Christ's righteousness as it is the righteousness of God in our nature, and as a surety-righteousness, alledging, that it is imputed under the latter, not under the former view. See *p.* 10. This is, perhaps, a refinement in the system of theology, which has exceeded the metaphysical genius of our systematic writers ; but it is such an improvement and discovery as claims no patronage from the sacred oracles ; and therefore deserves to be exploded. But what is our Lord's surety-righteousness, according to this teacher, if it is not strictly and precisely the righteousness of God in our nature ? Why, it is Christ's righteousness, as the material, internal cause of justification : A modern discovery ! that has been already considered. But, moreover, what avails it the new gospel this author pleads for, because

the very form, nature, and essence of our Lord's suretyship consisted in his being bound for the debt of others : or, because he was judicially substituted in our law room and stead. Will it follow from the premises, that the sinner's debt of obedience was or could be discharged by a perfect finite obedience? According to this teacher's doctrine, the consequence is native ; and abstracting from an infinite satisfaction, " a finite person might have been our surety," according to the doctrine of his Catechism already quoted.

Thus, according to this modern refiner, it was not at least " requisite that the Mediator should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his obedience ;" " it was only requisite that he should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his sufferings." What a new stroke in divinity is this, which must confront the doctrine of the Larger Catechism, *quest.* 38. and charge it with gross error and mistake? But again, this teacher is egregiously mistaken, in asserting, That " a finite person might have been our surety," abstracting from an infinite satisfaction. Does he not know, that, by breach of law-precept, the criminal debtor was subjected to a dreadful forfeiture? Was not the great inheritance of eternal life thereby mortgaged? Did not man, as a rebel against his great Lord, forfeit his very title to life, and to the promise of life? If this is granted, it will evidently follow, that in clearing scores with the preceptive part of the law, no other obedience was undertaken, or could be accepted, but such as was requisite for recovering the forfeited title, for instating us in *justification of life*, for intitling us to *reign in life*, by one, *Jesus-Christ*.
 Could

Could a perfect finite obedience be sufficient for this purpose? Nay, could God in our nature undertake an obedience of this kind? Wherefore, an obedience of infinite value was as requisite for clearing scores with the preceptive part of the law, after the breach of the law-covenant, as a satisfaction of infinite value was requisite for clearing scores with the penal sanction. It is therefore no argument against the imputation of our Lord's active obedience in its infinite value, "because the law demands no more from us than a perfect finite obedience." If the teacher intends that the law's claim upon Adam, our federal head and representative, was of no farther extent in a state of innocency, this is readily granted; but if he means that the law-precept, as broken, required no more from our blessed Surety, to recover a forfeited title to redeem the mortgaged inheritance, it is absolutely denied. Whatever obedience was given to law-precept by Christ, the elect's surety-representative, and accepted at the bar of law and justice, the very same was required and undertaken by him as a sponsor or surety; but the obedience given and performed by him to law-precept, was the obedience of his person God-man; therefore the obedience of his person God-man was required, and undertaken by him in his suretyship from everlasting. Every branch of this argument is unexceptionable from the sacred records: For example, the glorious Surety is expressly said to have been *made under the law*: *But when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son made of a woman, made under the law*, Gal. iv. 4. From this sacred passage it is quite obvious, that it was the Son of God in our nature that was made under the

the law, and not *an human nature* in the abstract ; therefore the law-covenant, as broken required the obedience of the Son of God in our nature, and not a perfect finite obedience. Thus it is certain, that even the very law-precept, as broken, required an obedience of the second Adam, the Lord from heaven, which it did not, nor could require of the first Adam, as a standing law : the demands therefore of the broken covenant, from which Christ's surety-righteousness was stated, must not be confounded with the demands of the law-covenant as standing, the rule and measure of the first Adam's obedience. Upon the whole, it follows, that the obedience of the Son of God in our nature being imputed to us in justification, it is imputed in its infinite value ; but if it is not imputed to us in its infinite value, it is not the obedience of the Son of God in our nature that is imputed. Thus an active obedience, stripped of an infinite value, is not the active obedience of the Son of God in our nature, but an airy figment substituted in its room. It must be an insuperable task for this teacher, or any for him, to authenticate such gross error.

His 5th and last argument is pretended to be drawn from the formal nature of righteousness ; wherein he fronts his new gospel with the title of this article of our Christian faith : And yet it is neither to be seen in the writings of Moses and the prophets, nor in the doctrine of Christ and his apostles, nor in our confession of faith, larger and shorter catechisms, nor in any other subordinate standard of orthodoxy that I know of. But that I may give all due attention to what is at last suggested by this teacher, in support of that subtle and refined article of his Christian faith, I must inform him, that any judicious argument drawn from

from the formal nature of righteousness, will never establish an heterodox position, viz. That our Lord's surety-obedience is not imputed to us in justification, in its infinite value, but rather the very reverse of what is thus taught by him, viz. That Christ's surety-obedience is imputed to us in its infinite value: neither will all the craft and subtilty of evasion, by new-coined distinctions, which are evidently without any appearance of scripture-warrant, make good his new article of divinity; these may well fatigue our attention, they will never inform our judgment. But how will this teacher be capable to render this new mode of doctrine authentic, from the sacred oracles, as it is laid by him, in summing up his fifth argument, viz. "That though the righteousness of Christ possess an infinite value as fulfilled by him, yet the law is only concerned with it as a perfect obedience to its precept, and complete satisfaction to its penalty?" His meaning is, that the holy law of God is not concerned with our Lord's surety-obedience, as an obedience of infinite value! That this is the plain meaning of the deceitful distinction, is evident from the doctrine of the 11th page; where we are told, that "the claims of the broken law are only a perfect obedience of a finite value, and an infinite satisfaction;" and therefore, according to the teacher, the holy law of God, in its preceptive part, as broken by the sin of man, is only concerned with our Lord's surety-obedience, as a perfect obedience of finite value. A mighty stroke of criticism indeed! But, moreover, what can this author intend by the formal nature of righteousness? Does it not constitute and enter into the very essence and formal nature of our

our Lord's surety-righteousness, that it is a righteousness, an obedience of a divine person, or a righteousness of infinite value? For example, in sacred language, it is frequently styled *the righteousness of God*, Rom. i. 17. Rom. iii. 21. 22. 2 Cor. v. 21. What! Does it belong to the formal nature of what is called, and is the righteousness of God, that it is a perfect finite obedience to law-precept, as the foregoing pernicious distinction would surmise? Is the law of the most high God only concerned with our Lord's surety-obedience under a certain capacity, which is absolutely incompatible with its very nature? Was not our Lord Jesus, as an undertaking surety, made under the law-covenant, in his mediatory person, God-man? Of necessary consequence, then, the holy law of God-must regard the obedience of the person God-man, and so as an obedience of infinite value. In fine, therefore, an internal cause of justification, (which is just as mysterious as the faith of the most bigotted Catholic); the consideration of our Lord's surety-obedience, under the proportion and capacity of a perfect finite obedience; the distinction between our Lord's mediatory righteousness, as it is the righteousness of God in our nature, and as it is a surety-righteousness; the allegation, that though the righteousness of Christ possess an infinite value as fulfilled by him, yet the law is only concerned with it as a perfect finite obedience to its precept, and complete satisfaction to its penalty,—are a catalogue of impertinent, anti-scriptural, and anti-philosophical distinctions, calculated for the support of an egregious fallacy. Upon all and every one of them may be written the ancient superscription, *Tekel, thou*

thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting, Dan. v. 27.

The author's liberal concession, p. 6. had almost escaped animadversion; it seems laid as a key by him to open an admission into the peculiarity of his doctrine. "Why," says he, "it is not my present inquiry, if believers, by virtue of their interest in the infinite person of Christ, are interested in his righteousness in the full and infinite value thereof. This," says he, "none that are found in the faith will impugn or pretend to dispute; but as imputation and interest are very far from being equally co-extensive in their signification, imputation indeed always infers interest, but interest is far from always inferring imputation." If the sentiment here laid by the writer will bear any determinate sense and meaning, it casts up in this shape, *viz.* That though believers, by their union to Christ, are interested in the infinite value of our Lord's surety-obedience, yet, in their justification, it is not imputed to them in its infinite value. The way how this critical and crafty turn is salved, is by an allegation, that *imputation* and *interest* are very far from being equally co-extensive in their signification. That they are not always of equal import, will readily be granted; for believers, by their union to Christ, are interested in the glorious Jehovah in all his divine excellencies, relations, and operations; moreover, by their union to Christ, they have an interestment in all the effects of a surety-righteousness, which are really *imparted*, not *imputed*. But what of all this? The question is neither about the believer's interest in the divine perfections, nor about his interest in all the effects of a surety-

F

righteousness,

righteousness, but about his interest, by *imputation*, in the surety-obedience of Christ in its infinite value; and here, at least, *imputation* infers interest, and interest *imputation*. Thus, it is morally impossible to conceive, how believers, by their union to Christ, can be interested in the infinite value of our Lord's surety-obedience, and yet his obedience not imputed to them, in its infinite value, in their justification; unless, in their justification, that was not placed to their account, nor reckoned upon their score, which really belonged to them in point of interest, and, let it be observed, which is capable of being imputed to them; and what a new figure would a supposition of this sort make!

Add to all this, if the infinite value of our Lord's surety-obedience were separable from the nature of his obedience, a believer might be interested in it, and the obedience in its infinite value not imputed to him; but this is impossible, and would destroy the exquisite glory and excellency of our Redeemer's obedience. It is, therefore, a doctrine of peculiar absurdity, for once to insinuate, that believers are interested in the full and infinite value of our Lord's surety-obedience, and yet to refuse that the same surety-obedience is imputed to them in its infinite value. Upon the whole, then, I am fully satisfied, that this writer's key by no means fits his purpose, and can never unlock an egregious mistake, upon the doctrine of imputed righteousness.

SECT.

S E C T. II.

HAVING thus briefly exploded the sophistical cavils, in the pretended arguments offered by the writer of the Dissertation, I shall now proceed to evince, that the glorious truth denied by him, is very capable of a large compass of proof, both from scripture and reason, and from our excellent standards of doctrine.

It is indeed extremely surprising, that the following proposition cannot be admitted, without a cavilling exception, *viz.* That the perfect obedience and complete satisfaction of Christ, as one uniform, undivided surety-righteousness is imputed in its infinite value to believers in their justification. In order, therefore, to establish and confirm this proposition, or which is a proposition of the same import, *viz.* That our Lord's surety-obedience is imputed to believers, in its infinite value, in their justification, as well as his full and complete satisfaction, I shall not accumulate, but select a few arguments, which, I hope, will prove decisive in this point.

1. This doctrine is abundantly confirmed and established from several passages of holy scripture, which evidently represent it in the strongest and clearest light. For example, I might appeal to that clear and convincing testimony, *Is. xlii. 21. The Lord is well pleased for his righteousness sake; he will magnify the law, and make it honourable.* From this memorable passage, which might be a decisive proof of the doctrine controverted, it is clear and evident, that no other righteousness but a righteousness of infinite value, could be well-pleasing

to God, and acceptable at the bar of law and justice ; and what other obedience could magnify the law, and make it honourable, but an obedience of infinite value ? wherefore the surety-obedience of Christ must be imputed to us in its infinite value. To speak of Christ's undertaking to fulfil the law by a surety-righteousness, as if it had not been an undertaking to magnify the law, and make it honourable, is so everfive of the aforementioned text, and is such a new cut in divinity, as can only have place in the author's catechetical system. Another forcible argument in defence of this truth, may be drawn from the same evangelical prophet, Is. xlv. 24. where we have the language of an assured faith strongly expressed, *Surely, shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness* ; or, as some read it, *Surely, he shall say of me, In the Lord is all righteousness*. It ought not to escape observation, that the phraseology in the original text is rendered in the plural number, *righteousnesses* ; which seems not to be used without an important design ; and so plainly implies the matchless fulness and supereminent excellency of the Lord's surety-righteousness, as comprehending whatever, either of suffering or obedience, is requisite to the justification of sinners ; but no less an obedience was requisite for making us righteous in law, for justification of life, than an obedience of infinite value, which must therefore be imputed to us as such. Where would be the matchless fulness and supereminent excellency of the obedience imputed, if it was an obedience of finite value ? or, where would be the ground of such distinguished gloriation ? as in ver. 25. *In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory*. Another scripture-authority, which

which evidently exhibits the doctrine pleaded for, we have recorded in Rom. iii. 22, where *the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ*, is expressly said to be *unto all, and upon all them that believe*. A determination so clear and satisfactory, as not to leave, one would almost conclude, any room for an appeal. It must be observed, from the passage quoted, that the righteousness of God here mentioned cannot signify his *essential* righteousness, but the *surety*-righteousness which he wrought out, in the law room and stead of his elect, as Jehovah the Father's bond-servant. Now, this surety-righteousness, being the righteousness of the Son of God in our nature, and therefore receiving the grand appellation of *the righteousness of God*, is, in justification, reckoned, imputed, or placed to the account of, and put as a garment of salvation upon every one that believes, of what nation or character soever he be, whether Jew or Gentile. Reader, if it is inquired what is that surety-righteousness which is upon every believer as a robe by imputation? the text quoted answers, That it is not a finite righteousness, but the righteousness of God, or the righteousness of the Son of God in our nature. It is to me very strange, that the new doctrine about imputed righteousness cannot admit this glorious and admirable truth, without a forced construction, a strained application, such as, That though the righteousness of God be imputed to us in justification, it is not in all respects imputed in its infinite value, but it is partly imputed in an infinite, partly in a finite value: Our Lord's surety-obedience is only imputed to us in a certain degree and proportion, under a certain consideration and capacity;

pacity; or, it is imputed precisely as a surety-righteousness, not as the righteousness of God in our nature. Oh strange! is not all this mutilating and parcelling doctrine evidently repugnant to the divine testimony quoted, *viz.* That *the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, is unto all, and upon all them that believe.* I might quote another sacred passage, very pertinent to the purpose in hand, and very explicit, in favour of the divine truth denied, 2 Cor. v. 21. *For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.* According to this remarkable portion of sacred writ, we are plainly taught, that all true believers in Christ are, in justification, constituted righteous in the sight of God, in a way correspondent to that in which Christ was made sin. And how was the great Surety made sin? Why, in point of *guilt imputed*, imputed to him without exception. In like manner, how are *we made the righteousness of God in him*? Why, in point of his *surety-righteousness imputed* to us, (which is here styled *the righteousness of God*), imputed to us in its infinite value, without exception. I say, without exception: for if there is any restriction, limitation, and exception, in the imputation of the surety-righteousness in its infinite value, there must be equally a restriction, limitation, and exception, in the imputation of our guilt to Christ. The very scope and drift of the text, is to prove, that we are made righteous, in justification, in a way correspondent to that in which Christ was made sin: And so, according to the new grammatical style of the *Dissertation*, our whole guilt could not be imputed to Christ, as his surety-righteousness, in its whole infinite value, cannot be
 be

be imputed to us. This is, plainly, the result of the new divinity, in the *Dissertation*, which cannot miss to issue in the perfect astonishment of impartial observers. To avoid prolixity, I shall only appeal to another scripture authority, to establish the point in question, Rom. v. 19. *For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so, by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.* As it is evident, from the first clause of the passage quoted, that all Adam's natural descendents, by the imputation of his criminal disobedience to them, were subjected to a law-charge of guilt, *made sinners*, and condemned as such; so it is equally obvious, from the latter part of the verse, that all Christ's spiritual seed shall, in due time, be judicially constituted righteous, and justified as such, by the imputation of his surety-obedience to them. Thus, it is evident, like sun-shine, that if all Adam's posterity are made sinners, in point of guilt imputed, without exception and limitation imputed; so all Christ's spiritual seed are, in justification, made righteous, in point of his surety-obedience imputed, imputed in its infinite value, without exception and limitation. I might have enlarged upon several other testimonies from the sacred writings: for the present truth defended, is copiously revealed through the scriptures of the Old and New Testament. There is no need here to use sleight of hand; *be that runs, may read.* But the above shall suffice for a specimen, that the orthodox doctrine, denied by the writer of the *Dissertation*, is evident by such divine authorities, as render it superior to cavil, and warranted beyond any exception.

2. This doctrine is apparently obvious from the state of justification, as it is directly opposed to

a state of condemnation. And what is immediately implied in the condemnation of a sinner? Why, he forfeits eternal life, and is doomed to eternal death. And what, on the other hand, is included in the justification of a sinner? Why, it supercedes his obligation to punishment, and invests him with a title to happiness? Now, it is asserted and maintained, that our Lord's surety-obedience, in its infinite value, is as requisite in justification, for recovering the guilty criminal's forfeited title, for reinstating him in the paternal favour of God, for the constituting of him as righteous in God's sight, as his full and complete satisfaction in its infinite value, is requisite, in justification, for reversing the sentence of condemnation the criminal is under, or superseding his obligation to punishment. The validity of this argument must be clear and convincing, if the nature of actual justification is strictly attended to; which, besides the pardon of sin, on the footing of a surety-righteousness, brings us into a new, a more glorious, and complete title to life, than ever we could have had, though Adam had finished his probationary obedience. Hence, says *the Lord from heaven*, the new covenant head, John x. 10. *I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.* Moreover, the eminent apostle assures us, that all believing receivers of the Lord's surety-righteousness *shall reign in life, by one, Jesus Christ*, Rom. v. 17.; and also mentions a *justification of life*, ver. 18.; not barely an exemption from the sentence of death, but such a justification as gives a title to the reward of life. Upon the whole, then, are believers in justification not only absolved from the condemnatory sentence of

of a broken law, and liberate from a charge of guilt ; but brought into a state of acceptance with God, deemed righteous in law, and actually intitled unto eternal life ? Are they restored to all this amazing honour, and transcendent dignity, upon the ground and foundation of a perfect finite obedience imputed ? And is this the surety-obedience of Christ ! Reader, how is the exquisite beauty and excellency of the doctrine of justification sullied and defaced by this pernicious scheme ? Our title to eternal life is not a whit better, according to this doctrine, than it would have been had the first Adam finished his *probationary* obedience. Nay, it is worse ; for a surety-obedience wanting an infinite value, is not the surety-obedience of Christ.

3. That our Lord's surety-obedience is imputed to believers in their justification in its infinite value, is conspicuously evident from the glorious nature and unity of his surety-righteousness, which is an undivided robe, an uniform garment of an infinite value, which is inseparable from it. Thus, the tenor of his obedience was most uniform, and uninterrupted, Phil. ii. 8. *And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.* The unity, uniformity, and undivided nature of Christ's surety-righteousness, is copiously displayed through the whole scriptures, revealed in many express passages, and deducible from a variety of instructive similitudes. Thus, it is elegantly set forth under the metaphor of a robe, the best robe, a garment, the garment of salvation, Is. lxi. 10. Luke xv. 22. This is a robe, a garment, which not only screens from the sword of justice, the curse of the law,

and from all the vengeance which breach of covenant deserved ; but a robe, a garment, which adorns and dignifies the soul in the sight of God. Though we may distinguish between the active and passive obedience of our ever glorious Redeemer ; yet such is their unity and uniformity, that they cannot be *separated*. It is impossible they should be disjoined, or even be divided from an infinite value, or be independent on each other ; for had either branch of the mediatorial obedience been wanting, it may well be supposed, that neither pardon nor acceptance, nor any spiritual blessing, could have been vouchsafed to fallen man. They were undivided in Christ, the glorious Surety, and so must be undivided in their legal application to his mystical body. It must be remembered, that as Christ in suffering obeyed, and in obeying suffered ; so whosoever receives him as an *atonement* by his death, receives him also as a *righteousness* in his holy nature and righteous life. It was therefore, beyond controversy, an egregious error and mistake in some foreign divines, who were otherwise orthodox upon the gospel system, particularly *Piscator*, *Wendelin*, and others, who asserted, “ That all that was necessary to the justification of God’s elect, was the sufferings and death of Christ ;” and affirmed, “ That our Lord’s surety-obedience was only a qualification requisite to his being the Mediator.” But was not this to divide our Lord’s surety-righteousness, and to leave believers in their justification still under a forfeited title, or without a legal title to life ? For if the sufferings and death of Christ are only imputed in justification, then the sentence of condemnation is only reversed ;

sed; and believers have only a legal security against eternal death. But their title to life is not restored, nor constituted, without the perfection of Christ's active obedience, in conjunction with the efficacy of his passive. What though our justification be in holy scripture ascribed to the blood of Christ, Rom. v. 9.; yet is it not the blood of Christ put both for his active and passive obedience, the one being finished in the other? It is therefore a doctrine of divine revelation, that as our Lord's surety-obedience was performed for us, in our law room and stead; and as we are expressly said to be *made righteous* by it, Rom. v. 19. and as the law of God required it: so all that the law of God required, must be imputed to us for justification. If the author of the *Dissertation* had been of the sentiment of *Piscator* and *Wendelin*, in my humble opinion, his doctrine had been more of a piece, his hypothesis had been of far greater consistence, and must have at least hung together, however naked: but to grant, that our Lord's surety-obedience is imputed in justification, and yet to deny that it is imputed in its infinite value, is to rush upon a contradictory doctrine, which cannot hang together, and which is void of any plausible dress. Where is the connection of purposes in this doctrine? A surety-obedience imputed, and yet not imputed in its infinite value: This is, upon the matter, to deny the imputation of Christ's surety-obedience altogether; for if it is not imputed in its infinite value, it is not imputed as the obedience of a divine person; and so cannot be the obedience of Christ that is imputed. Whence it is evidently consequential, that the doctrine that would fix upon a certain

degree and proportion in a robe of such intrinsic excellence, and absolute perfection, as our Lord's surety-righteousness, is a doctrine highly derogatory to the glorious nature, unity, and uniformity of the surety-righteousness imputed.

4. This glorious truth might be farther vindicated from this important and interesting consideration, *viz.* That it is the surety-obedience of the *person* God-man that is imputed in justification, (not the obedience of the *human nature* of Christ, in the abstract, which is not a person in Christ). That this is the doctrine of the sacred scriptures, is incontestably clear and convincing: and it will be impossible for all the sagacity in the world, to prove this point of doctrine an absurdity, though it should ever remain an inexplicable mystery. And if the author of the *Dissertation* should again put the question, "How can it be imputed to us formally in this view, who are mere creatures, mere men?" or as Nicodemus said, upon another grand point, "How can these things be?" our Lord's answer to the Jewish doctor shall suffice for a reply to him: *Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?* John iii. 10. If it is therefore the obedience of the person God-man that is imputed in justification, then, of necessary consequence, it is imputed in its infinite value; for it is incapable of any other consideration, than as the obedience of the person of Christ. Does not this teacher know, that from the hypostatical union of the two natures, divine and human, in one individual person, it is, that the actions of each nature are the actions of the same one person. Thus it was the person God-man who fulfilled all righteousness, the Son of God in our nature, that was

was made under the law; and therefore it must be the surety-obedience of the Son of God in our nature, which is the fulfilling end of the law; and thus it is Christ, God-man, *who is the end of the law for righteousness*, -Rom. x. 4. Wherefore it is very far from being a doctrine consonant to this great mystery of grace, to affirm, that the surety-obedience of the person God-man is not imputed under that capacity to believers in their justification: for surely, if it is not imputed in its infinite value, it cannot be imputed as the obedience of the person. This is a consequence so native and unexceptionable, that it cannot be disputed. Notwithstanding it should be granted, that our Lord's surety-obedience is imputed to us, as the fulfilling end of the law, or as a perfect conformity to the law; this can no way supersede the imputation of his obedience in its infinite value: for it was the obedience of the Son of God in our nature, which was, and is the fulfilling end of the law to every one that believeth; or, in words of the same import, it was the surety-obedience of *Immanuel, God with us*, which was, and is a perfect conformity to the preceptive part of the law. It must be a distinction as well as a doctrine both anti-evangelical and antiphilosophical, to distinguish between Christ's surety-obedience, as it is a perfect conformity to the law, and as it is the obedience of the person of Christ, God-man; and upon the ground of this subtle theory, to conclude, that, in justification, it is imputed to us as a conformity to the law, and not as it is the obedience of *Immanuel, God with us*. This is, I confess, a trimming expedient, too soaring for the Holy Bible. But in opposition to such an injudicious nicety,

nicety, it is maintained, that the surety-obedience of Christ, and the obedience of the person God-man, are phrases of the very same import and signification; and therefore it cannot otherwise be placed to our account in justification, than as an obedience of infinite value and dignity. It is withal very certain, that the contrary doctrine must land its whole disciples in the following absurdity, viz. that our Lord's surety-obedience, in justification, is imputed as the obedience of his human nature only. This is undeniably the very language, nature, and result of the whole scheme: for if our Lord's surety-obedience is not imputed in justification in its infinite value and dignity; then it must be imputed only as of finite value, and so as the obedience of our Lord's human nature only. But how injurious such a doctrine is to the glorious unity of the person of our Redeemer, *be^t that runs may read*. Does not this author know, that the wonderful person of our Redeemer is the glorious subject in which his human nature only subsists, and that it is not a person in Christ; and that therefore the obedience of the human nature of Christ, in distinction from his person, is a *non-entity*? Does he not know, from a celebrated performance, that it is both *vain philosophy* and *vile divinity*; and that therefore to set up for an obedience of finite value, as the ground of our justification, is an attempt to revive the error that was buried in the Treatise of mental images? How, in the nature of things, can that doctrine, in the native consequences of it, consist with the glorious unity of the person of Christ, which pretends to maintain, that Christ's passive obedience is imputed in justification in its infinite value, and his active obedience only under the capacity

capacity of a finite value; and which would distinguish between our Lord's mediatory obedience, as it is the obedience of the person God-man, and as a surety-obedience? Nay, it is impossible for it to comport with the glorious constitution of the person of Christ. This teacher therefore must be told, that to consider our Lord's surety-obedience as of finite value, or as if it were the obedience of "an abstracted nature, however *holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners* ; and not as the obedience of the person God-man; is to misconstrue the unity of the glorious person of Christ, and to strike at the merit and value of his obedience. Such a distinction, such a doctrine, would far better suit the taste of a Cambuslang convert; or a promoter of the scheme of imaginary ideas, relative to our Lord's human nature. Our Lord's surety-obedience, as the obedience of the person God-man, being therefore imputed to us in justification, we have a complete answer to all that the broken law demands, in order to the justification of a sinner. And, moreover, God's judicial deed, in imputing a surety righteousness, being always according to truth, Christ's surety-obedience in its infinite value must be imputed to us. It is impossible to understand the connection and harmony in the opposite doctrine: it is quite a scene of confusion and contradiction. How can the passive obedience of Christ be imputed in the infinite value, and not the active? Is not this to divide them in their imputation; which is derogatory to the unity of our Lord's surety righteousness? How can it be imputed as the righteousness of God in our nature in the passive obedience, and not as the righteousness of God in our nature in the active obedience?

obedience? Can the holy law of God lay a foundation for separating and dividing an indivisible robe? Can believers be justified by Christ's merits, and not be jointly interested in them by imputation? How can the infinite value of our Lord's active obedience in justification be separated from it, any more than from his passive obedience, when the infinite value is one, and indivisible, and so competent to them as but one complete surety-righteousness? How can believers in justification be interested in the infinite value of Christ's passive obedience by imputation, and not in the infinite value of the active? Is not his surety-obedience as expressly called *the righteousness of God*, as his blood is called *the blood of God*? Is not, therefore, the infinite value as inseparable from his obedience as from his blood? How then is it the obedience of the person God-man that is imputed, if it is not imputed in its infinite value? Has the criminal transgressor, under a forfeiture of life, no other obedience imputed to him, to recover and fix his title to eternal life, than a perfect finite obedience? Could a perfect finite obedience constitute a sinner righteous in law after he had forfeited his title? Could an obedience of finite value bring him into a new, a complete, a more glorious title to life, than ever man could have had before? It is then a doctrine of a most dangerous nature and tendency, to deny, that our Lord's surety-obedience is imputed to believers in their justification in its infinite value; as, on the contrary, it is a most precious gospel-truth, a doctrine worthy of all acceptance, that *the righteousness of God is unto all, and upon all them that believe*; and that every true believer, whether

whether among Jews or Gentiles, is, in justification, interested, by imputation, in all Christ's righteousness, in the whole merit of his spotless nature, of his perfect obedience and expiatory death. Less than the whole would be unavailable; whereas the whole renders us completely justified.

5. That the scope and substance of this argumentation is well supported by our renowned standards of doctrine, is obvious to a demonstration. For example, can a doctrine of this consequence be more explicitly taught, than in the Larger Catechism, which is certainly the best summary, both of doctrinal and practical divinity, now extant in the world. See answer to question 38. The question is thus stated, "Why was it requisite that the Mediator should be God?" The answer is thus returned. "It was requisite that the Mediator should be God, that he might sustain and keep the human nature from sinking under the infinite wrath of God, and the power of death, give worth and efficacy unto his sufferings, obedience, and intercession," &c. From this grave answer, this sound speech that cannot be condemned, it is as evident as language can make it, that it was requisite that the Mediator should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his surety-obedience, as well as to his sufferings. But, according to the doctrine of this teacher's Catechism, it was not requisite that the Mediator should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his obedience: it was only requisite that he should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his sufferings. For example, we are expressly taught, in his Catechism, p. 169. That "a finite person might have been our surety," abstracting from an infinite satisfaction.

Reader, see how this teacher would make depre-
dations upon the Larger Catechism; see how his
doctrine would make a sponge upon it. But he
must be told, that that doctrine ought to be held
in great detestation, that would deny either more
expressly, or by necessary consequence, the ne-
cessity of the Mediator's being God, in order to dis-
charge any branch of his work of mediation. The
necessity of the Mediator's being God, that he might
give worth and efficacy unto his surety-obedience,
is undoubtedly a glorious truth, that ought no
more to be disputed, than that he is God; and is
an invincible argument that his surety-obedience is
imputed to us in its infinite value. For,

How it was necessary that he should be God,
that he might give worth and efficacy unto his o-
bedience, and yet his obedience not be imputed
in its infinite value, is impossible to understand.
And as to the doctrine of the Mediator's Godhead,
it is the foundation-rock upon which his church is
built, and which *the gates of hell shall never pre-
vail against*, Matth. xvi. 16. 18. 19. It may be
justly observed concerning this rock, that if the
batteries of impiety could have brought it down,
or the underminings of craft could have blown it
up, we should have lost it long ago. For almost in
every age, the gates of hell have opened all ways,
and poured out their forces with a prodigious varie-
ty against it: but their several attacks have been
ever unsuccessful, and ever shall; for the church
continues to stand, and the truth continues to rest
where Christ left it.

Again, that our Lord's surety-obedience is im-
puted to believers, in their justification, in its infi-
nite value, is farther evident from the doctrine of the
Larger

Larger Catechism, in answer to question 40. The question stated is, "Why was it requisite that the Mediator should be God and man in one person?" The answer given is, "It was requisite that the Mediator, who was to reconcile God and man, should himself be both God and man, and this in one person, that the proper works of each nature might be accepted of God for us, and relied on by us as the works of the whole person." From this solid and judicious answer, the two following positions are incontestably evident. 1. That it was the surety-obedience of the person God-man, that was accepted of God for us at the bar of law and justice. 2. That it is in the same capacity as the obedience of the person, that it must be relied on by us. What proofs can be more explicit, and more cogent, in favour of the foregoing reasoning? Is it possible to evade the native consequences arising from the premisses as laid by our venerable reformers; viz. That as it was the surety-obedience of the person God-man, that was given for us to the preceptive part of the law, and that was accepted of God for us at the bar of law and justice, and that must be apprehended and relied on by us for justification, then, as the surety-obedience of the person, it is imputed, and, of consequence, in its infinite value.

In fine, I might produce several extracts from other passages in our subordinate standards, all pouring in their concurring evidence, with the quotations already offered. See Confession of Faith, chap. ii. art. 1. "Those whom God effectually calleth, he also freely justifieth, by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them."

"them." Larger Catechism, in answer to quest. 70.
 "Justification is an act of God's free grace unto
 "sinners, in which he pardoned all their sins, ac-
 "cepteth and accounteth their persons righteous
 "in his sight, only for the perfect obedience and
 "full-satisfaction of Christ, by God imputed to
 "them." Shorter Catechism, in answer to ques-
 tion 33. "Justification is an act of God's free
 "grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and
 "accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for
 "the righteousness of Christ imputed to us, and
 "received by faith alone." Is there any the least
 surmise in these passages, that a finite person might
 have been our surety, abstracting from an infinite
 satisfaction? Is there any the least insinuation in
 these extracts, that the perfect obedience of Christ
 is only imputed under the capacity of a perfect finite
 obedience, and his full satisfaction in its infinite va-
 lue? Very far from it; any suggestions of this sort
 would have been quite incompatible with the ne-
 cessity of the Mediator's being God, that he might
 give worth and efficacy unto his obedience; and
 quite incongruous with the imputation of the per-
 fect obedience and complete satisfaction of the
 person God-man, Immanuel, *God with us*; and so
 must have produced a strange contradiction in these
 standard-systems of orthodox divinity. Reader,
 behold then the judgment of our venerable reform-
 ers, the declared doctrine of the reforming and
 covenanting church of Scotland, the avowed be-
 lief of her most eminent divines; and conclude,
 that it is the surety-obedience of the person God-
 man that is imputed to believers in their justifica-
 tion.

Upon

Upon the whole, it shines with convincing lustre and evidence, that this important and interesting doctrine is widely mistaken, grievously traduced, and grossly misrepresented, when it is pretended to have been the sentiment and dialect of the Familists, and other distracted enthusiasts of the last century. Surprising! Was this one of the vile and detestable errors of these blasphemous heretics, "That the surety-obedience of the person God-man is imputed to believers in their justification?" If this is the heresy of Familism, it is highly probable, the reformed churches have grossly mistaken their principles: which for any to suppose, would be insufferable impudence. But it is notour, that this was, in fact, never an article of their monstrous creed. These wild, blasphemous, and heretical enthusiasts, upon the doctrine of the mystical union, pretended, that the saints were made partakers of the nature and essence of God, made sharers of Christ's essential righteousness, as the Son of God, and so were godded with God, and christed with Christ; and that God was manned and humanised in the saints. See Rutherford's Survey of the spiritual Antichrist, in his discoveries of Familism. But it was never an article of their diabolical creed, that the surety-righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers as the righteousness of the person God-man. Very far from it. It shall as soon be made evident to have been an article of their monstrous faith, "that it was requisite the Mediator should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his surety-obedience," as it shall be instructed to be Familism, that the same surety-obedience is imputed to believers in its infinite worth

worth and value. If the latter is Familism, so is the former; and what an egregiously blunder and calumny would this be? The author of the Dissertation, therefore, grossly imposes upon his admirers, in retailing this groundless charge, this opprobrious epithet of Familism, upon the foregoing doctrine; and upon the matter, without either truth or shame, brands our excellent standards of doctrine with the heresy of Familism: but they are in no danger of being attainted by a false verdict, and must therefore succeed in vindication of what has been impugned. I might here add, that if it is Familism to teach, "that the surety-obedience of Christ is imputed to believers in its infinite value," which is denied to be Familism point-blank, then let the promoter of this ungrounded clamour purge himself of his pretended Familism, in granting this wholesome doctrine, that "the passive obedience of Jesus Christ is imputed to believers in its infinite value." Indeed he shall as soon, upon good evidence, lead the charge of Familism against the latter, as against the former. But to conclude this section, it is truly no wonder, that he who has acted the part of the false mother*, relative to the surety-obedience of Christ, in pretending to maintain, that its infinite value is divided from it, when it is imputed to us in justification. I say, it is truly no wonder, that he should have his Dissertation to purge of what carries in it the genuine complexion, the black marks of Familism, viz. his internal cause of justification, which, according to his own explication of it, is Familism in its utmost rigour.

S E C T.

* The false mother said, concerning the living child, *Divide* it, 1 Kings iii. 26.

HAVING thus evinced the credibility and certainty of the doctrine of imputed righteousness in its infinite value; and having found it liable to no such cavilling exception as is suggested by the writer of the *Dissertation*; but, on the contrary, very capable of a large compass of proof, both from the sacred oracles, and our subordinate standards of doctrine; it now remains to be proved, according to the general plan, that the queries put by him can no way invalidate the doctrine, which is pretended to be impugned by him. In order to evince this, I shall now undertake to offer a distinct reply to what some may reckon are the most material queries proposed by this teacher. In the mean time, the intelligent and unprejudiced reader will easily observe, that the peculiar manner of stating his questions, is miserably tarnished with the running plague of *egotism*, with triumphant and positive airs: But as the King of Israel answered and said to the messengers from Benhadad King of Syria, *Tell him, Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself, as he that putteth it off*, 1 Kings xx. 11.

Query 1. "Did, or could the precept of the covenant of works, demand from innocent Adam, or any of his posterity represented by him, a debt of infinitely valuable obedience?"

Ans. No. The condition of the covenant of works was perfect obedience; perfect in point of parts, degrees, and continuance; perfect to an abstaining from the tree of knowledge of good and evil,

evil, as a test of his fidelity, a proof of his subjection to his great creator, and confederate benefactor. I cannot but think it would be new style, if not a flagrant impropriety, to add the word *finite* to perfect obedience, in describing the condition of the covenant of works ; as if it should run, " The condition of the covenant of works was perfect finite obedience ;" for as the subject was but a mere creature, who had not as yet committed iniquity, which is an infinite evil ; so the law, as the rule of his covenant-obedience, could demand no other obedience from him, to accomplish the ends of that federal transaction. Thus, in answer to quest. 12. Short. Catech. we are told, that " when God had created man, he entered into a covenant of life with him, upon condition of perfect obedience." The dialect is not, " upon condition of perfect finite obedience ;" this would have been an improper, at least, a superfluous addition ; the subject being but finite, and his state innocent. But, moreover, it may be proper here to confront this teacher's query with a new list. What doctrine is it that lays a foundation for this new question ? It is absolutely refused, that there is any the least occasion offered from the scriptural doctrine, stated and defended, to propose such a query. Is it because the law, as a broken covenant, required the surety-obedience of the person God man, who was *made under the law*, that this author's opponents must be thus interrogate ? How is it possible, that this can lay a foundation for such a question ? or, Is it because the apostle expressly affirms, that *the righteousness of God is unto all, and upon all them that believe ?* Rom. iii. 22. Or is it, because he in like manner

ner affirms, *for he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him,* 2 Cor. v. 21. that such a question must be put? Let therefore the following queries, proposed by this teacher, to the close of the paragraph, stand for an answer to the first: perhaps this may satisfy him.

Query 2. "Did not the second Adam enter into the law room and stand of his elect, as standing where the first Adam left them, *i. e.* as subjected to the original demand of the precept; and moreover lying under the penalty of the covenant of works?"

Ans. It cannot be refused to bear the face of orthodoxy, that the second Adam did enter into the law room and stand of his elect, where the first Adam left them; or, that the glorious Mediator, as an undertaking surety, entered upon and fulfilled that same law, which man had broken, and which his elect lay bound under. But what then? The question is, In what state and condition were they left? Why, were they not left miserable bankrupts, under an insupportable burden of debt, under a forfeiture of life, under the loss of the mortgaged inheritance? Our Lord Jesus, therefore, in surrogating and substituting himself in their law place and condition, became surety for their criminal debt; and thus, taking on their obligation, and transferring on himself their state of servitude, a foundation was laid for law and justice to exact their criminal debt from him. But to render the case still more evident, as to their dreadful loss and misery by the fall, let it be observed, that, by breach of covenant, they were not only subjected to the lash of the penal sanction, but likewise incurred a most dreadful forfeiture, even

a forfeiture of life. For while man was in honour, he had a good title unto the privileges of the covenant, to all that protection, friendship, and favour, which God had engaged to bestow; but, abiding not in honour, he forfeited his title to his Lord's favour, and to promised life and privilege. Now, it is impossible to understand what other obedience to the preceptive part of the broken covenant could be effectual to recover, to restore the forfeited title, to the broken, to the insolvent debtor, to the full reparation of the honour of law and lawgiver, but a surety-obedience of an infinite value. In token hereof, it was requisite, that the Mediator, as an undertaking surety, should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his surety-obedience. Thus, as it was the Son of God in our nature that was made under the preceptive part of the law, Psal. xl. 7. Gal. iv. 4. so it was he also, in our nature, that was made a curse for his elect, Gal. iii. 13. This being the doctrine of the holy oracles, it is impossible to see how the precept of the law-covenant, as broken, could require any other obedience from him than the obedience of the Son of God in our nature; and indeed no other obedience could serve the gracious purpose intended. For, however the perfect obedience of the first Adam could have, by positional merit, procured and preserved a legal title to life, yet it was impossible that the same obedience to law-precept could recover it after it was forfeited and mortgaged. It will be proper then, in closing this answer, to serve the reader with the substance of the preceding paragraph. If the law, as a broken covenant, could only require and admit a perfect finite obedience from the great Surety, would

would not the imposed condition, in this case, have been infinitely impossible? Would it not be as impossible for the glorious Mediator to give an obedience of finite value, as it would have been impossible for the first Adam, or any of his posterity, to have given a perfect obedience of infinite value? Is not then the supposal of any such thing horrid and impious? And may I not add, Is it not a piece of very blundering divinity, in this teacher, to confound the extensive claims of a broken law, which were made upon the Son of God in our nature, with the original demand of the law-precept, as standing, the rule and measure of the first Adam's obedience?

Query 3. "If believers have the active obedience of Christ imputed to them in its infinite value, is it not plain, that they must necessarily be accounted in law as infinitely comely, infinitely worthy, infinitely holy, and infinitely righteous?"

Ans. It is so very far from being plain, that the inference is absolutely inconclusive, the consequence is a groundless fiction. It is in vain for this author to colour over the deformity of his beloved tenet, by the paint and varnish of this artful shift. That it can no way invalidate the principle already established, will be quite obvious, if the following particulars are considered. 1. It is not the essential righteousness of the Son of God, the moral perfections of his nature, which is imputed to believers in their justification; but his surety righteousness, his perfect obedience, and complete satisfaction to law and justice. 2. In the act of justification, the surety-obedience of the person God-man is not transfused into us, so as to be made inherently and subjectively ours, but it is only

placed to our account, ours in law-estimation. The justification of the sinner being only a relative change, a change of state, not a change of the nature, the righteousness of the law is not fulfilled in us formally, subjectively, inherently, and personally, but only imputatively. Thus, it is not in us as a righteousness inherent, but upon us as a robe or garment, and so can no way metamorphose the nature of the object, to whom it is imputed, as the author's consequence would insinuate." 3. This surety-righteousness, which is styled *the righteousness of God*, is expressly said to be *unto all, and to be upon all them that believe*, Rom. iii. 22. Moreover, believers are said to be *made the righteousness of God in him*, 2 Cor. v. 21. How will this teacher's inference sound from these express declarations? Why, it is, that therefore all believers are Gods; a consequence rigorously strained, from a principle which cannot suffer it. 4. It might be as strongly argued, *ceteris paribus*, that, because the guilt of our iniquities was judicially imputed to the great Surety, by way of law-charge, that therefore he was constituted inherently a sinner, infinitely guilty, &c. There would be something more wrested in a consequence of this kind than a blundering absurdity. 5. It might yet, with greater strength of argument, be concluded, that because the human nature of Christ is hypostatically united to his divine nature in his glorious person, that therefore his two natures are no more distinct, but blended and intermingled; and that our Lord's human nature, in his glorious person, is rendered omniscient, omnipresent, and omnipotent, as the Lutherans affirm. But, to set this argument in a clearer light, it may well be supposed,

supposed, that our Lord's human nature, in his glorious person, (to speak with reverence), is as near, if not nearer his divine nature, by the hypostatical union, than his surety-obedience can be supposed to be upon a believer by imputation. It is certain that there is the most incomprehensible approach of the divine nature, in the person of the Son of God, unto his human nature; nay, such is the incomprehensible nearness of the two natures in that glorious person of Christ, that, in holy language, attributions are made of the properties of one nature to him, whilst he is spoken of under a title which relates to his other nature; or, those things are spoken of Christ, as denominated from his divine nature, which are only proper to his human nature. See Acts xx. 28. 2 Cor. ii. 8. And this is what our systematic writers call *a communication of idioms or properties*: and yet, after all, it would be the most absurd doctrine, to infer that our Lord's human nature is therefore infinitely worthy, infinitely comely, and infinitely holy. Nay, it is affirmed, that, notwithstanding of the hypostatical union of the two natures in the glorious person of Christ, his human nature is only, and will remain for ever, perfectly amiable, perfectly righteous, and perfectly holy. In like manner, it is impossible to understand, what other consequence can follow from the imputation of the surety-obedience of the person God-man, to believers in their justification, but that they are only accounted in law as perfectly righteous, and perfectly comely. This teacher may therefore depend upon it, that the strained consequence in the query can only be the native result of his internal cause of justification; which, according to him, is Christ's surety-righteousness within the person, as must be
the

the language of an internal cause. And here it is proper to pose him with a question of his own stamp: "How can the persons of believers, in their justification, admit of such infinite exaltation and glory?" Moreover, this querist might be strictly interrogated, Wherein doth the imputation of Christ's passive obedience in its infinite value, which is a doctrine taught and acknowledged by him, come short, as to what is here charged upon the imputation of Christ's active obedience in its infinite value? Will not the author's unfair consequence militate, as strongly against what is thus taught and acknowledged by him, relative to the passive obedience of Christ? If Christ's full and complete satisfaction be imputed to us in its infinite value, which we hope never to deny; may it not with equal strength be inferred from this, that we are infinite saviours, infinite redeemers, infinite ransomers, and that we are infinite meriters of our own justification and salvation? It is really astonishing, to see this teacher, page 14. denying, with all his might, that the imputation of Christ's passive obedience in its infinite value constitutes us infinitely righteous in law, but only legally innocent; and yet frequently affirming, with all his might, that the imputation of Christ's active obedience, in its infinite value, constitutes us infinitely righteous in law. But perhaps, as a celebrated author suggests, jargon and inconsistency may not be without their propriety in this place; as they tend to show the genius of that doctrine, that would connect such contradictory ideas, in the doctrine of imputed righteousness.

Query 4: "If Christ's surety-obedience to the pre-
ceptive part of the law is imputed to believers in

" its

"its infinite value, are not then believers, in law-reckoning, as righteous as Christ? Is not this, says the teacher, to set the believer on a level with Christ himself? What more wicked and injurious to the adored Immanuel?" p. 13.

Ans. This is the very consequence which is managed by the patrons of the Papal hierarchy against the imputation of Christ's surety-righteousness altogether; a consequence also very much improved by the Neonomians against the same orthodox doctrine, and also by the Arminians, particularly by John Goodwin, in his scandalous treatise on justification. This being matter of fact, no honour can redound to this querist, in managing such a weapon, considering the armoury to which it belongs. What then can he intend by digging up this stale artifice, which has been exploded as a mere fraud in all ages? Can he expect to carry the cause of his new gospel by this craft? No, no. For, 1. It will readily be granted, that believers, in law-reckoning, are not as righteous as Christ *quoad modum*. The surety, and the principal debtor, are not one physically, but legally and juridically. The believing receiver of the surety-righteousness is not, in law-reckoning, the author and finisher of it, not his own saviour and redeemer, not subjectively righteous like Christ, or in point of inhesion, but objectively righteous, or in point of imputation. Thus, in law verdict and estimation, our Lord Jesus is righteous as the Son of God in our nature, righteous as a surety-representative, as the glorious head of the mystical body, as the one only Mediator betwixt God and man, as the Saviour and Redeemer of an elect world: wherefore believers are not, in law-reckoning, in this sense, righteous, for the law's

law's judgment being always according to truth, can never confound the believing receiver of the surety-righteousness, with the author and finisher of it. That, then, believers are as righteous as Christ *quoad modum*, is a position that must be rejected. But, 2. Will this teacher refuse, that believers, in law-reckoning, are as righteous as Christ *quoad veritatem*? If this is his sentiment, I must dissent from it, upon the following considerations.

1. It counteracts the express testimony of Heaven, which is sufficient to overthrow it, 1 John iii. 7. *He that doth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous.* 2. If Jesus Christ and believers, the cautioner and principal debtor, are one in law-reckoning; then there can be no separating of them, in law, in point of life and death. Hence says our Lord, John xiv. 19. *Because I live, ye shall live also.* The law-covenant can have no action, no suit, against a justified person, any more than it can have against his glorious head; it can lay him no more under an arrest, than it can his surety-representative, who has got up his discharge, Rom. viii. 33. 34. * 3. It is, therefore, neither

Familism

* Thus the principal debtor, in the eye of the law, may be said to be as righteous as the surety, without prejudice to the dignity, honour, and pre-eminence of the surety. For to be as righteous as Christ, in law verdict and estimation, respecteth not the manner; for the surety and the debtor are not physically one; but the truth and reality of our being righteous. And if it was nowise injurious to the glorious Surety, that he, and the principal debtor, became legally one; how can it be injurious to him, that the principal debtor become legally righteous with him? Since, as is well observed by worthy Mr Rutherford, concerning the nature of suretyship, in his treatise of the covenant, part 2. p. 251. "Though physically the surety and the debtor be two different men; yet, in law, they are one

"and

Familism nor Antinomianism, to affirm, that believers are legally righteous in the sight of God, with the self-same active and passive obedience wherewith Jesus Christ was righteous. This doctrine shines every where in the sacred oracles, with a bundance of evidence. The Neonomians, therefore, in branding it as a doctrine of Antinomianism, are guilty of impeaching a most precious truth, with a most injurious calumny. Why, is not the mystical union between Christ and believers, legally sustained at the bar of law and justice, in so far as, that, upon this union, what Christ did and suffered for them, is reckoned in law, as if they had suffered and done it themselves? Are not Christ and believers legally one, in point of interest, by the mystical union? In as much as he becomes one mystical person with them, in filling himself their federal representative at the bar of law and justice, and having the guilt of all their sins imputed to him: so, on the other hand, all that he did and

“ and the same person, and one and the same legal party, and
 “ the same object of justice; who in law pursueth the surety,
 “ doth also pursue the debtor. The debt and sum is one, not
 “ two debts, not two ransoms, not two punishments, not two
 “ lives to lose, but one. It is one and the same solution and
 “ satisfaction; there cannot, in law-justice, come another rec-
 “ koning, dying, and payment-asking, after the surety hath
 “ paid. There is one and the same acceptation, upon the
 “ creditor's part; if he accept of satisfaction in the payment
 “ made by the surety, he cannot but legally accept of the
 “ debtor, and cannot pursue him in law, but must look upon
 “ him as no debtor. It is one and the same legal effect. Christ
 “ justified in the spirit, and we in him, as in the meritorious
 “ cause, are legally justified.” Hence it is evident, that, as the debt
 of the principal debtor becometh the debt of the surety, and
 affecteth him; so also the satisfaction and payment of the sure-
 ty, and his discharge and relief, becometh the satisfaction, pay-
 ment, discharge, and relief of the principal debtor.

suffered in his obedience to the death, is imputed to them. The guilt of their transgressions was imputed to him, as if he had been personally obnoxious; and what he did in their law room and stead, is placed to their score, as if done by them; thus having, in law-reckoning, as really obeyed in Christ, as they disobeyed in Adam, *the righteousness of the law* is said to be *fulfilled in them*, Rom. viii. 5. fulfilled in them: how? why, imputatively, or in point of legal estimation. It is therefore a doctrine that may be admitted as genuine, that believers, *quoad veritatem*, are as righteous as Christ in law-reckoning, though not *quoad modum*: and what other consequence can follow from the imputation of our Lord's surety-obedience to believers in its infinite value? This, then, is a doctrine neither wicked, nor injurious to the adored Immanuel; a doctrine which makes no incroachment upon the pre-eminence and prerogative of the glorious head, nor carries in it any the least prejudice to any of his precious truths, but is a part of, and fully consonant to the whole system.

Query 5. "Doth not the broken law of the most high God lay the foundation of the distinction I have made, as to the proportion of value in which the active and passive obedience of Christ is imputed?"

Ans. It is utterly refused, that the broken law of the most high God lays any the least foundation for such a distinction. The law-covenant, in its extent, rigour, and perfection, is holy; *the commandment is holy, just, and good*; and therefore can lay no foundation for measuring an indivisible robe, by the rules of proportion. Can such cutting and carving in an one and uniform garment be the work of the holy law? I forbear to give

give such a bold and shocking doctrine its proper designation. Where would be the uniformity of the demands of a broken covenant upon the great surety, if a complete satisfaction of an infinite value had been exacted from him, and only a perfect obedience of finite value? Where is the connection of the law's extensive claims upon our surety representative, according to this distinction? Can the holy law of God lay a foundation for overthrowing the uniformity of its demands? Was not the Son of God in our nature as really made under the preceptive part of the law, Gal. iv. 4. as he in our nature *was made a curse*, Gal. iii. 13.? If once the sovereign plan and purpose of redeeming bankrupt sinners is granted, must it not follow, with the evidence of a demonstration, that the law covenant as really demanded an obedience of infinite value for that end, as a complete satisfaction of an infinite value? and were not both given to the broken law as one uniform, complete surety-righteousness? Was not the one as requisite for the salvation of God's elect as the other? How could we be made the righteousness of God in him? How could we be enstated in justification of life? How could we reign in life by one, Jesus Christ? How could we be sustained in law as righteous persons, having a title to all the benefits and privileges of the *sons of God*? How could we have any pleadable ground or foundation in law for claiming the reward, without the one as well as the other? Thus considering what rights and privileges belong to believers as justified persons, what just claims and titles they have; and consequently, what they presently possess, and what they have to enjoy hereafter;

can they hold all this upon the tenure and footing of a perfect obedience of finite value? No, no; it is impossible, absolutely impossible. Why, but this modest and humble inquirer makes no bones of insinuating, that all this is, in effect, a heightening the demands of the preceptive part of the law-covenant; and that he may stun the incautious reader, puts the following questions in this shape, "How
 " can I, or any creature alter the different proportion of these demands, by heightening the one,
 " and lowering the other? How can these everlasting mountains be overturned by me? Dare
 " I incline to attempt it? Can I change the extent
 " of Christ's surety-engagements, and bound them
 " by other limits, than that of the elect's debt?
 " Can I cause his righteousness to be imputed under any other form or view, than as it is a
 " surety-righteousness?"

Reader, these are a list of unparalleled queries, perhaps, scarce to be equalled by the most presumptuous interrogations of the sauciest pontiff that ever occupied the chair at Rome. And therefore he must be told, that he has attempted to overturn a truth infinitely more precious than either the *everlasting mountains*, or the *perpetual bills*, viz. the imputation of the surety-obedience of the person God-man to believers in their justification; and has attempted to substitute an obedience of finite value in its room. Can the extent of our blessed Lord's suretyship-engagements be more wofully misconstrued? when it is pretended, with an air of assurance, that the precept of the broken law required only such an obedience from him as was impossible for him to give, viz. a perfect obedience of finite value; and that a finite
 a person

person might have been our surety, abstracting from an infinite satisfaction; and, of consequence, that it was not requisite that he should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his obedience. This is indeed an attempt to overturn a compend of valuable truths, infinitely more stable than mountains of brass. It is in vain for him to father his doctrine of proportion, either more or less, upon the precept and penal sanction of a broken covenant, and to form these holy demands into a covert, to mask his antiscriptural distinctions. It is impossible these can serve him for a retreat, in making such wild excursions; and therefore it was just and proper for him to say, in the question, *the distinction I have made*. And since he claims the honour of making it, he is extremely welcome to be held and reputed its original author; for ought I know, he is the very first that ever invented such a distinction. It will certainly be extremely hard for him to find a distinction of this very mould and likeness in the writings of any orthodox divine, or in any ecclesiastical history. There is no doubt but he may cull out particular sentences from the writings of the orthodox, and pervert, strain, and wiredraw them to serve his turn; but, I believe, he may be defied to find any orthodox divine that was of his mind in so many words, viz. That our Lord's surety-obedience is not imputed to believers in its infinite value. There have been divines, of no small figure in the Christian church, who denied the imputation of Christ's active obedience altogether; but I question if there was ever any that acknowledged the imputation of Christ's active obedience, and yet denied that it was imputed as the obedience of the person
 God man,

God-man, but imputed only as an obedience of finite value.

Query 6. "What was the absurdity of my teaching in my catechism, that the active obedience of Christ is not imputed in its infinite value?"

Ans. So great was the absurdity of teaching such a doctrine, that words are wanting to express it: but if this teacher is wanting a *tessera*, a sketch of its glaring absurdity, he will be pleased to receive, among others, the following wild grapes produced by it; for, according to the words of truth, *a tree is known by its fruits*. Let it be considered, then, that the doctrine which denies that the surety-obedience of Christ is imputed to believers in its infinite value, evidently bears, that it is not the obedience of the person God-man, that is imputed in justification, but an obedience of finite value, which is not, nor cannot be the surety-obedience of Christ. Again, the doctrine taught, has led the teacher, to confound the demands of a broken covenant, from which Christ's surety righteousness was stated, with the demands of the law-covenant as standing, the rule and measure of the first Adam's obedience. Again, the doctrine taught, has led the teacher, upon the matter, to maintain, that it was not requisite the Mediator should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his obedience; for, according to his catechetical doctrine, quoted again and again, a finite person might have been our surety, abstracting from an infinite satisfaction. Again, it has, in effect, plunged him into this absurdity, that the proper works of each nature in our Redeemer's person could not be accepted of God for us, and so cannot be relied on by

by us, as the works of the whole person ; for, according to him, our Lord's surety-obedience in justification, is only imputed to us in a finite value ; which evidently bears, that it was only accepted of God for us, as the obedience of the human nature of Christ, (not as the obedience of his person), and so must only be relied on by us as such. Farther, the doctrine taught has led the teacher to attempt to divide the infinite value of our Lord's surety-righteousness between it, as the meritorious, and the material cause of our justification ; and to deny, that Christ's surety-righteousness is imputed as the meritorious cause of our justification ; and to maintain, that Christ's surety-righteousness, as the material cause, is an internal cause of justification ; and to distinguish between our Lord's surety righteousness, as it is the righteousness of God in our nature, and as a surety-righteousness ; and to affirm, that though the righteousness of Christ possess an infinite value, as fulfilled by him, yet the law, as a broken covenant, is only concerned with it, as a perfect finite obedience to its precept, and complete satisfaction to its penalty ; and that though believers are interested in the infinite value of our Lord's surety-obedience, yet it is not imputed to them in its infinite value. Moreover, the doctrine taught has led him to father his different proportions of value in Christ's surety-righteousness upon the holy law of God, and to make it a subterfuge for all his antiphilosophical and antisciptural distinctions ; and to load the imputation of Christ's surety-obedience in its infinite value, with the opprobrious epithet of *Antinomian* and *Familistic blasphemy* ; and to impress a number of eminent writers into his service,

by

by gross and palpable misrepresentation; and to pervert the faith of some, relative to the doctrine of justification, in causing them to believe, that they have no pleadable ground or foundation in law, for claiming all the rights, privileges, and immunities belonging to justified persons, but a perfect obedience of finite value; and that this is sustained in law, as the ground of an adjudication of eternal life to them. Finally, it has led him to esteem it his happiness, that he maintains an egregious fallacy. Thus I have presented to him a parcel of the poisonous fruit which has sprung from the stem of his denying, that our Lord's surety-obedience is imputed to believers in its infinite value*.

Query 7.

* What a world of new-coined distinctions must be obtruded upon mankind, to support the tottering fabric of a darling tenet! Some writers are never in their element, but when they are over head and ears in the depths of mystic theology. The Judaizing teachers in the apostolic æra were men of this kind: they were great admirers of cabalistical learning and traditions; and slighting the plain sense of the sacred writings, they contrived mystical and allegorical senses, even in the most plain passages of scripture; and pretended to find mysteries in words and letters; and thus they dealt in vain jangling, understanding neither what they said, nor whereof they affirmed. Of this sort also were the poisonous insasions of the Gnostics, which gave so much disturbance to some of the primitive churches. And was not this the grand crime imputed by the orthodox fathers to Origen, that, despising the simplicity of the scriptures, and Christian theology, he affected new terms and modes of interpreting scripture? Add to all these, the scholastic divines who flourished about the middle of the thirteenth century, and dealt much in the plunge of mysticism in their science of theology falsely so called. An eminent divine describes their character in this manner. "These school-divines, instead of coming to the study of holy things, with an holy humble frame of heart, praying and waiting for divine illumination

Query 7. "How can the denial of the imputation of Christ's active obedience, as to the infinite value thereof, in the least impair the consolation, or stop the boasting of believers?"

Ans. As it is ground of strong and everlasting consolation to all believers, that the glorious and blessed Redeemer has, in the name and behalf of his chosen, fulfilled the law-covenant, answered all its extensive claims, and satisfied the whole demands that justice had to make upon them, and at the same time, and in the same capacity, purchased and procured all the rights, titles, privileges and immunities, belonging to justified persons; so nothing can be more effectual to restrain and damp their spiritual joy, than to deny the imputation of the surety-obedience of Christ in its infinite value; which recovered their title to eternal life, with all that belongs to it, and whatever Adam by his transgression forfeited; nay, and, moreover, which restored it with an overplus of the highest honour, advantage, and delight, John x. 10. Can any thing be more conducive to them

mination and teaching, that they themselves might be made wise in the mysteries of the gospel, and able to instruct others in the knowledge of God, (a method which alas! never came into their minds), they came puffed up in their fleshly minds, with a conceit of their own ability, sagacity, and penetrating faculty, and provided with philosophical notions and conceptions, with syllogisms, sophisms, distinctions, solutions, and other crafty windings of man's serpentine wit: and thus accoutred, they set boldly upon divine revelation, framed the gospel to their own imaginations, by dressing it up in the foolish attire of their metaphysical subtilties and terms of art, or rather their profane and vain babblings, thereby wholly corrupting and debasing it, and drawing off the minds of men from the simplicity of the truth as it is in Jesus Christ."

the tide of their consolation, and to vail their spiritual joy, than to tell them, that *the surety-obedience of the person God-man, which was sustained and accepted at the bar of law and justice, is not imputed to them as such*; and that *they have nothing to found their title to eternal life, but an obedience of finite value, which is imputed to them in their justification*? The querist here might be asked, "Would it not impair the consolation, and stop the boasting of believers, if the imputation of Christ's passive obedience in its infinite value was denied?" If this is granted, must not a denial of the imputation of Christ's active obedience in its infinite value, have the very same influence? Where is that soaring genius, that can see the consequence to hold as to the former, but not as to the latter? It is indeed an antidote of singular novelty, tendered by this teacher to believers, after he has attempted to deprive them of any interest, by imputation, in the infinite value of Christ's surety-obedience, to tell them, that, by their union to Christ, they are interested in the full and infinite value of his whole righteousness, as abiding in his person. But he should remember, that, according to his doctrine, it was not requisite that the Mediator should be God, that he might give worth and efficacy unto his obedience: and therefore to tell believers, that they are interested in the infinite worth and value of an obedience that was not necessary, is a most glaring absurdity. How can this be ground of gloriation to any person? But farther, the believer's interest, by his union to Christ, in God's infinite perfections, in all his fulness, in Christ's unsearchable riches, however it afford strong consolation, yet it is not his interest

interest in all this that formally answers the law's accusations, but his interest, by imputation, in a surety-righteousness of infinite value, which contains a complete answer to the precept and penalty of the law of works. Now, it is here that depredations are made upon the believer's interest, which cannot miss to cloud his holy boasting and gloriation. But, finally, this teacher proceeds in a most surprising manner, and, after a course of haranging query, about the grounds of the consolation of believers, poses them thus, p. 16.

“ Shall they notwithstanding be grieved, that I will
 “ not allow them to be by imputation constitute
 “ as righteous in law, as the infinite and glorious
 “ Immanuel? Is not this, on the matter, to be grie-
 “ ved, that they cannot become infinite persons?”

What more blasphemous? I confess, I can see nothing, either of the philosopher, or the divine, in these mighty fallies; and besides the flagrant impropriety of the dogmatism, it is somewhat like the *crambe repetita*, and recurs, and recurs, and recurs, till it is really tiresome.

Query 8. “ Have not I, in this point, walked
 “ in the good old way?”

Ans. That it is an old way that you are walking in, cannot be doubted; for it is full of stones, stumbling-blocks, thorns, and briers: but that it is the good old way you have trod, is flatly denied; for there are no traces of that to be seen in the strange paths of your new gospel, no more than there are vestiges remaining of *the way of an eagle in the air*, of *the way of a serpent upon a rock*, of *the way of a ship in the midst of the sea*. If there is any thing of antiquity in the doctrine you are maintaining, it can only be the stench of it;

like those feeble supports which have been brought from afar, by the advocates for the Prelatic system. And here it is proper to inform you, that as you are *departed out of the way, you have caused many to stumble in their ways from the ancient paths, to walk in paths, in a way not cast up*, Jer. xviii. 15. It is therefore high time for you to desist in your course ; *and make straight paths for your feet, lest that which is lame be turned out of the way, but let it rather be healed*, Heb. xii. 13.

Query 9. " Do not multitudes, nay all the orthodox Protestant divines, as they have occasion, concur with, and support my sentiments on this head ? "

Ans. This is your last effort ; but it must prove as unsuccessful as to the gaining of your point, as your former attempts have been. Your famous doctrine of certain proportions in an undivided surety-righteousness is what, I am sure, no orthodox divine ever maintained. It has indeed been customary for the adversaries of truth, (Professor Simson himself not excepted), in pursuit of their cause, to go searching into books, bringing out passages directly opposite to the design of the authors. The dissingenuity of this practice is too gross for any but the advocates of a corrupted cause to admit of. The Professor mentioned, when he found himself strongly besieged, attempted, for his own defence, to impress Dr Owen and some of the ancient fathers, to help him to support his infamous and scandalous banner ; as may be seen in his answers to Mr Webster's libel. I beg leave here to subjoin a very apposite illustration of this unaccountable conduct, from an eminent writer against the Arians ; who finding, that Dr Owen and Dr Manton were introduced

introduced as friends to some of the penticles of that disgraceful cause, delivers himself thus.

“ It is using mankind very ill, to put such things upon us. It may be all one to me, what such a doctor saith about the divinity of Christ : his opinion is neither the argument, nor the hinderance of my faith : but, however, let me not be imposed on in matter of fact : let us not have deceitful reports ; no lie is of the truth. If the doctrine I am contending for be right, it will be so without fathers or doctors ; but why should I make a false muster, both to wrong the dead and abuse the living ? It is unfair to give out men as advocates for a notion, when we ourselves know they were enemies to it ; it is a reproach upon their names, and God will arise to make inquisition for scandal as well as for blood. It is using them like the two witnesses, whose dead bodies will be exposed by a barbarous world ; that is a great inhumanity ; but, methinks, it is a viler insult upon their memories, to make them say what they never thought of. Certainly those writers do not remember, that the saints shall judge the world, who take a liberty to abuse them by whole generations, as if it was not enough to bring a lying accusation against the living, unless they did it also against the dead. But as these great men died in the Lord, and rest from their labours ; so their works shall follow them, not to reproach them, but to praise them in the gates.” Reader, if you are unprejudiced, I shall make no apology for transcribing this excellent passage. I presume it will be acceptable.

But to proceed ; The author of the Dissertation having strained a variety of consequences from the

the orthodox doctrine, which is opposed by him, falls now to the work of perverting the principles of orthodox divines, upon the doctrine of justification; and that, as is above observed, either by misconstruing, or concealing, or stretching out with violence, some expressions used by them. For a specimen and sketch of this unfair and unchristian conduct, it will be proper to examine his quotations from a few; though, in the mean time, we may observe, with Mr Wilson, in his preface to the Defence, p. 9. "That though quotations from great and learned men may be of very considerable use to illustrate and clear an argument, yet if the argument, especially when it is upon a religious subject, leans only to the authority of men, the simple and credulous may be either amused or imposed upon; but it can never be convincing and satisfying to such as with knowledge and judgment search after the truth; besides, when in a dispute, the authority of great and learned men is thrown up, we are led to inquire into the sense and meaning of these great writers; and it is only a fruitless spending of time, to insist in debates about the sense and meaning of the words of great and learned men." [I may add, in the words of this eminent writer]; "I would have willingly avoided any thing of this nature; but our author has obliged me unto it, not only that I may do justice unto the great names whom I judge our author has injured, but especially that I may do justice to the cause against which he has employed his pen."

The quotations from Mr Boston's *Views of the covenant of grace*, (in the Dissertation), are extremely manqué, lame, and defective, and are, moreover,

moreover, interlined. It is true, indeed, the interlinings are inserted in a parenthesis: but then they are printed in the same character with Mr Boston's words; and no advertisement is given, that they are supplements; whereby the simple and credulous cannot miss to be imposed on, as if they were all Mr Boston's words. For example, according to the extracts, in the Dissertation, from the 2d edition of the *View of the Covenant*, Mr Boston says, p. 54. 57. "Christ sisted himself surety for their debt, (which) was stated from the broken covenant of works in the whole (not a greater) latitude of the demands it had on them, (which) was infinite punishment and perfect (not infinite) obedience. Christ obliged himself to clear it, (the debt of obedience), by fulfilling what the law could demand of them in this kind." Now, reader, compare this quotation with the pages referred to, and you will assuredly find, that, besides the contracting of Mr Boston's sentiments, the words, *not a greater, not infinite*, are additions made by this teacher. The quotations from p. 85. 86. are all very contracted, and do very much fully the beauty of Mr Boston's doctrine. In his quotation from p. 90. the words, *not a greater*, are a supplement of his own.

In p. 141. 142. of the excellent book aforementioned, we are told, that Mr Boston maintains, that precisely, on account of this surety-righteousness imputed to a believer, he is, in justification, accepted as righteous. The genuine passage runs thus. "Upon these grounds, the holiness of Christ's nature, the righteousness of his life, and the satisfaction made by his death and sufferings, being the constituent parts of that righteousness, are,

“ are, according to truth, imputed to the believer,
 “ or legally reckoned his ; and, upon the account
 “ thereof precisely, he is accepted of God as righ-
 “ teous, (it follows), *being made the righteousness*
 “ *of God in him, 2 Cor. v. 21. the righteousness of*
 “ *God being upon all that believe, Rom. iii. 22.*”

Now, reader, if you will but give yourself the small trouble of subtracting the additions made by this teacher to Mr Bolton's doctrine, and of reading the sentences which he has concealed, you will readily find, that there is not the smallest inconsistency, but the strongest harmony between Mr Bolton's *View of the Covenant of Grace*, and the doctrine that has been defended. If the author of the Dissertation could instruct, from Mr Bolton, that the precept of the broken covenant, in order to man's recovery, only required a holy human nature and a righteous life, without union to the person of Christ, or that a finite person might have been our surety, abstracting from an infinite satisfaction, he would infallibly gain ground from a divine of very distinguished ability ; but this he shall never accomplish ; and if he proves not this, he proves nothing from that eminent servant of Christ. Before concluding this paragraph, I might appeal to the intelligent and observing world, if he has not dealt, in like manner, with Mr Bolton's *View of the Covenant of Grace*, as the rigid favourites of an anti-scriptural system wrest the Holy Bible. “ They
 “ deal with divine truth,” (says Mr Hervey, in his *Theron and Aspasio*, vol. 2. p. 43). “ as the
 “ tyrant Procrustes served those unhappy creatures
 “ who fell into his merciless hands. Is a text too
 “ short to suit their purpose ? Our Procrustean ex-
 “ positors can stretch it on the rack, and lengthen

" its sense. Is it too full to consist with their
 " scheme? They can lop off a limb, secrete a sen-
 " tence, or contract the meaning." The applica-
 tion is easy, considering what is above observed.

Again, this author's quotation from Mr Boston's
 Miscellany Questions is so very manque and contract-
 ed, that those who have never read the questions,
 nor Mr Gibbons's sermon, might imagine, that Mr
 Boston, instead of opposing a Neonomian, is wa-
 ging war with some other adversary. But it is ne-
 cessary to inform them, that the doctrine of Mr
 Gibbons which Mr Boston is opposing, is of the
 very same complexion with the doctrine of the au-
 thor's Dissertation. I love to assert nothing without
 proof. Mr Gibbons very roundly teaches, that
 Christ's active and passive righteousness was a mere
 supererogation. See *Morn. Exer. meth.* p. 384.
 Now, upon this doctrine of Gibbons, the author
 of the Dissertation eloquently dilates. For, accord-
 ing to him, " there is an infinite degree of propor-
 " tion in Christ's righteousness above the law : the
 " law is infinitely more than fulfilled by this degree
 " of proportion : the precept of the law only de-
 " mands a finite proportion of what Christ wrought
 " out, but the penal sanction an infinite propor-
 " tion : there is a finite value in Christ's active o-
 " bedience, but not in his passive : the law mul-
 " tiplies and divides Christ's righteousness." After
 this manner, p. 16. 2d edit. of the Dissertation,
Quid hoc monstri! This might be styled, at least,
 profound and mysterious nonsense. If any man
 will make it stand the dint of scripture and reason,
erit mihi magnus Apollo.

But, farther, according to the scheme of Gib-
 bons, the very doctrine that Mr Boston is teach-

ing in the question referred to, is an Antinomian heresy. Thus, I find, upon tracing the scope and connection of purposes in Mr Bolton's doctrine, we are expressly taught, *p.* 46. That "Christ and the
 "believer are but one person in law, as the cau-
 "tioner and principal debtor, the advocate and his
 "client, the husband and wife; yea, much more
 "than any of these, in so far as our union with
 "Christ is a more strait union than any of those
 "amongst men." Again, *p.* 47. the orthodox doctrine is in this manner expressed by him:
 "That likeas whatsoever the first Adam did, or
 "befel him, is reckoned as done by, and to have
 "befallen all mankind; so whatsoever the second
 "Adam did, or befel him as head of his people, is
 "reckoned on their account. So then, as in Adam
 "they sinned, eating of the tree; so, in Christ,
 "they suffered, hanging on the tree; as in the first
 "Adam they broke the law, in the second Adam
 "they repaired the breach thereof."

Now, this doctrine, according to Mr Gibbons's sermon, quoted *p.* 47. of the *Miscel. Quest.* is one of the foundation-props of the Antinomian heresy. Mr Bolton says, he is much piqued at it; and if the bold sting of scandal had been suggested to him, it is more than probable he would have called it a vile venomous viper. But why is he so much chagrined at this doctrine? Why, because it necessarily follows, that a believer, is righteous in the sight of God, with the self-same active and passive righteousness wherewith Christ was righteous, as though believers suffered in Christ and obeyed in Christ. Now, reader, if you will but inspect Mr Bolton's notes upon the *Marrow*, *p.* (*mibi*) 141. you will find that this very doctrine which
 Gibbons

Gibbons condemns, is again quoted from his sermon, and, by extracts from our standards, proved to be the very doctrine of the Westminster confession of faith, catechisms larger and shorter. Moreover, upon a review of the notes upon the Marrow, p. 183. I still find the very reverse of Mr Gibbons's doctrine taught by this eminent divine. The author of the Marrow suggests, in the page quoted, "That whosoever is married to Christ, and so in him by faith, he is as acceptable to God the Father as Christ himself; according to that of the Apostle, *He hath made us acceptable in his Beloved*, Eph. i. 6."

In the explicatory note, subjoined by Mr Boston, upon this Marrow doctrine, we find, among others, the following positions: "That Christ's righteousness is theirs, in virtue of their union with him, and is imputed to them; the which righteousness is the self-same righteousness, wherewith Christ, as Mediator and Surety for elect sinners, pleased the Father. And therefore, says one, whom nobody suspects of Antinomianism, We are as perfectly righteous as Christ the righteous, citing 1 John iii. 7. *He that doth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous.*" *Isaac Ambrose, media, chap. 1. sect. 2. p. (mibi) 4.*—See also a quotation from one in the notes upon the Marrow, p. 211. "Christ (saith he) is made unto us holiness, righteousness, and justification: he hath clothed us in all his merits, and taken to himself all our sin." Now, reader, though both Mr Gibbons, and the author of the Dissertation, should abhor this doctrine as a vile venomous viper; yet it is a doctrine worthy of all acceptance, a doctrine taught

in *the Marrow of Modern Divinity*, and in the explanatory notes upon that book; and which is more, according to Mr Boston, a doctrine taught in our standards. I might well add, that it is certain, that if believers, in law-reckoning, be not as righteous as Christ, they must, in law-reckoning, be less righteous; and who can define a lower degree of righteousness in law, save the universal *salvo* in the Dissertation, which, like an oracle, is capable of making responses by different proportions of value, in an undivided and uncompounded righteousness, neither to be understood in the sacred records, nor in the philosophic systems?

In fine, as the passage quoted in the Dissertation from the Miscellany Questions is a little dubious, so it is more than probable, that, if Mr Boston had thought it proper to guard the construction of 1 John iii. 7. *He that doth righteousness, is righteous, even as he is righteous*, he would have transcribed it from the questions in his notes upon the Marrow, more especially when it is observed, that he had both an opportunity in opposing Mr Gibbons's doctrine, which is quoted by him in the notes, and in the quotation from Isaac Ambrose, viz. "We are as perfectly righteous as Christ," citing 1 John iii. 7. But it seems to have been purposely kept back by him, when these two circumstances are considered. It is therefore most unaccountable to triumph upon one or two dubious sentences which were written by him in his younger years for his own improvement, without any design of being printed, according to the advertisement to the reader, prefixed to his posthumous works.

But yet, after all, should any handle be made from the passage in the Miscellany Questions, in my humble opinion it might be easily surmounted, if we shall but

but do Mr Boston a piece of common justice, so as to explain any sentence which is dubious in his words, from Dr Owen on justification, *p.* 509. 510. from which the passage seems to have been partly taken, and to which there is an express reference in the margin. By this means all occasion of cavil will be cut off, truth will be cleared, and the words of these two eminent servants of Christ will be rescued and acquitted from the perversion and abuse of this new teacher. To tell the plain truth, it will be extremely hard to make us believe, that either Dr Owen or Mr Boston were the favourites of a doctrine, which pretends, that there are different proportions of value in Christ's mediatory righteousness, and that some of these proportions belong to us, and some not.

But to proceed : In Mr Boston's *Miscellany Questions*, the dubious sentence stands thus : " There being a finite application of an infinite " righteousness, not in respect of the full value of " it, but in so far as our necessity craves it." In Dr Owen, on justification, *p.* 516. the similar passage runs thus. " But it is imputed unto us " only with respect to our personal want, not as " it was satisfactory for all ; but as our souls stand " in need of it, and are made partakers of it." Now, these are the two passages ; the one of which must be a key to the other. *N. B.* Neither Dr Owen nor Mr Boston, in terms, affirm, " that " the active obedience of Christ is imputed to us " under the proportion and capacity of a finite value, but his passive obedience in its infinite value." This consequence is only extorted from the passages quoted by the author of the *Dissertation*, which proves a notorious want of modesty in him.

It is evident, from the connection of purposes
in

in Dr. Owen's doctrine, that he is refuting Bellarmine's objection against the imputation of Christ's righteousness altogether. Why, says the stale advocate for the Popish doctrine of justification by works, "if Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, then we may be said to be the saviours and redeemers of the world." "No," says Dr. Owen, "Christ's righteousness is not imputed unto us as it was satisfactory for all, but as our souls stand in need of it." His meaning is, that it is only imputed to us, as wrought out in our law room and stead, and so as satisfactory for our souls in particular: And therefore the objection of the Popish disputant is of no relevancy; for it only follows from the imputation of a surety-righteousness, that we are redeemed and saved, not at all that we are saviours and redeemers.

That this is the plain meaning and sense of Dr. Owen's words, is evident from his refutation of the same objection, p. 308. where he delivers himself clearly as to the purpose in hand. Why, says he, "we do not say that the righteousness of Christ, as made absolutely for the whole church, is imputed unto every believer: but his satisfaction for every one of them in particular, according to the will of God, is imputed unto them; not with respect to its general ends, but according unto every one's particular interest." Now, reader, when Mr Boston says, that there is a "finite application of an infinite righteousness, not in respect of the full value of it," his meaning is, that it is legally applied to the soul, not as it was satisfactory for all, not with respect unto its general ends, but only in so far as our necessity craves it; that is, it is only imputed

puted to us, as it was a righteousness wrought out in our law room and stead, and so as satisfactory for our souls in particular, not as satisfactory for all God's elect. But what then is the consequence? Why, is it that the imputation of Christ's surety-righteousness in its infinite value is thereby vacated? Very far from it. I am ready to think, that the necessity of imputing it in its infinite value, is rather thereby strongly demonstrated. For if it is imputed to us, as wrought out in our law room and stead, and so as satisfactory for our souls in particular, how can it otherwise be imputed, than as of infinite value? for it was only as of infinite value, that it was satisfactory for our souls.

Moreover, that Dr Owen, as well as Mr Boston, was of the sentiment, that Christ's surety-righteousness cannot be divided, but is imputed unto us in its infinite value, is evident from the following illustrious and decisive testimony, *p.* 390. of his treatise on justification, "Besides," says he, "both the satisfaction and obedience of Christ, as relating unto his person, were in some sense infinite, that is, of an infinite value; and so cannot be considered in parts; as though one part of it were imputed unto one, and another unto another; but the whole is imputed unto every one that doth believe. And if the Israelites could say, that *David was worth ten thousand of them*, 2 Sam. xviii. 3. we may well allow the Lord Christ, and so what he did and suffered, to be more than us all, and all that we can do and suffer." It was in vain therefore for the author of the Dissertation, to compel Dr Owen and Mr Boston to lead the van of his human authorities: they cannot be vouchers for a doctrine that

that would rush the article of imputed righteousness into a wild chaos of anarchy and confusion. Verily, that must be a poor cause indeed, that must be served by passages brought out of books directly opposite to the design of the authors. *False witnesses rise up against them, and lay to their charge things that they know not.*

But farther, the late Mess. Ebenezer and Ralph Erskines, together with the late Mr James Hervey, are brought upon the carpet, as votaries for the new doctrine. But we shall see by and by, that none of the evangelical doctrines taught by these valuable writers, can serve the cause of another gospel. It is certainly but a despicable shuffle, for the author of the Dissertation to tell us, *p. 20. 2d edit.* That, "upon a review of the most of the Mess. Erskines works, he finds them of his sentiments."

To instruct the contrary, let us have recourse, with Mr Hervey, to the works of Mr Ebenezer Erskine, and take his volumes for our tutor.

I appeal then to the comprehensive doctrine laid by him, in his sermon, intitled, *The broken law magnified and made honourable, Collect. of Ser. p. 53.* "That Christ, as our glorious surety, having magnified the law and made it honourable, the Lord Jehovah declares himself to be well pleased for his righteousness sake." In dividing the doctrine, the first branch of it is thus expressed by him, "That Christ, as our surety, has magnified the law, and made it honourable, by his obedience to the death." In *p. 69.* Mr Erskine sums up the purposes of his doctrine, thus. "Thus you see how Christ magnifies the law and makes it honourable, as a covenant, fulfilling

" fulfilling the righteousness of it in his own per-
 " son, as our Surety." According to another go-
 " spel in the Dissertation, " it was not Christ's surety-
 " obedience that magnified the law, and made it
 " honourable ; it only fulfilled it : the magnifying
 " the law, and making it honourable, did not arise
 " from his surety-engagement, but only from the
 " dignity of his person ; the law was magnified and
 " made honourable by Christ's righteousness, as the
 " righteousness of God in our nature, not by it as
 " a surety-righteousness." Is not all this the very re-
 " verse of Mr Erskine's doctrine, while we are taught by
 " him, that the law is magnified and made honourable,
 " by Christ's surety-righteousness ; and that Christ's
 " surety-obedience is imputed to us, as magnifying
 " the law, and making it honourable ? See p. 75.
 " Why, says Mr Erskine, " See the error of those
 " who deny Christ's active obedience to the law
 " to be any part of our justifying righteousness ;
 " alledging, that it is only his passive obedience,
 " or his suffering the penalty, that is imputed to
 " us for justification. Why, when it is said here,
 " that Christ magnified the law, and made it ho-
 " nourable, it must needs be understood of his
 " obedience to the precept, and that principally,
 " because the precept or command only is the law ;
 " the penalty is not essential to it, but only a
 " thing consequential in case of disobedience ; so
 " that his magnifying the law must needs have a
 " respect to the precept, and his obedience to the
 " precept of the law is properly his righteouf-
 " ness, which is imputed to us, Rom. vi. 19.
 " *By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous ;*
 " and it is upon this that our title to life doth stand,
 " as Adam's title in the covenant of works stood

N

" upon

“ upon his own perfect and personal obedience to
 “ the command.”

Now, reader, if it is Christ's surety-obedience to law-precept which magnifies the law and makes it honourable, the consequence is in no respect broader than the premisses, which affirms, that it is imputed to us in its infinite value.

Again, this very important doctrine is most copiously displayed, in a sermon of Mr Ralph Erskine's, intitled, *The best bond, or surest engagement*. See vol. 2. Lond. edit. p. 328. “ Man by his
 “ sin hath broken the precept of doing, forfeited
 “ the promise of life, and incurred the penalty of
 “ death. Now, if ever we approach to God in
 “ mercy, this broken precept must be repaired,
 “ this forfeited life must be redeemed, this incur-
 “ red penalty must be executed, and endured.” See p. 329. “ And accordingly Christ comes,
 “ and, by his obedience to the death, he magni-
 “ fies the law, and makes it honourable. The
 “ precept of the law that we had broken, he must
 “ fulfil by obeying perfectly. The promise of e-
 “ ternal life, which we had forfeited, he must re-
 “ cover by redeeming the forfeiture, bringing in
 “ an everlasting righteousness: The threatening
 “ and penalty of eternal death he must endure, or
 “ the equivalent, by coming under the curse of
 “ the law.” Now, reader, could a perfect finite obedience magnify the law, and make it honour-
 able, repair a broken precept, recover a forfeited title? No such thing.

I might also appeal to Mr Erskine's *Faith no fancy*, p. 308. Why, says he, “ from the u-
 “ nion of the two distinct natures in one individual
 “ person, it is, that the actions of each nature are
 “ the

“ the actions of the same one person. Thus it was
 “ the person of God-man who fulfilled all righte-
 “ ousness, preached, wrought miracles, suffered,
 “ died.—Hence the merit of his obedience,
 “ hence the value of his sufferings. And to speak
 “ of the doing, suffering, and death of Christ as
 “ man, or in his human nature, as if they were
 “ not to be considered as the doing, suffering, and
 “ death of the person God-man, is to weaken and
 “ undermine our redemption by him, and destroy
 “ the merit and value of his obedience and satisfac-
 “ tion.” Reader, how will this orthodox doctrine
 tally with another gospel, which affirms, that
 a finite person might have been our surety, abstract-
 ing from an infinite satisfaction; and that the
 surety-obedience of the Lord from heaven is im-
 puted to us in a finite value?

Moreover, I might confront the new gospel, in
 this author's catechetical system and dissertation,
 with a late essay, intitled, *The assembly's shorter ca-
 techism explained, by way of question and answer; by
 some ministers of the gospel.* N. B. This explicatory
 catechism is prefaced by Mess Ebenezer Erskine
 and James Fisher: and, according to the preface,
 Mr Ralph Erskine assisted in composing and re-
 vising this first part. It is true indeed, the author
 of the Dissertation attempts to lead in this cate-
 chism among his human authorities; but we shall
 see immediately, that the two catechisms do not
 quadrate, but widely differ upon the point in dis-
 pute.

In the foresaid explicatory catechism, p. 163.
 the following question is proposed and answered.
Quest. 38. “ Why was it requisite that our Media-
 “ tor should be God?” *Ans.* “ That his obedience

“ and sufferings in our nature and room, might be of
 “ infinite value for our redemption, Acts xx. 28. ;
 “ and that the human nature might be supported
 “ under the infinite load of divine wrath, which he
 “ had to bear for our sins, Rom. i. 4.” According
 to this answer, it was requisite that our Media-
 tor should be God, that his obedience in our na-
 ture might be of infinite value for our redemption,
 as well as his sufferings. But, according to the ca-
 techetical doctrine taught by this author, it was
 not at least requisite that our Mediator should be
 God, that his obedience might be of infinite value
 for our redemption.

For example, p. 169. of his catechism, we
 have the following questions and answers, which
 have been already quoted. *Quest.* “ Why then
 “ did Christ perform an infinitely valuable active
 “ obedience?” *Ans.* “ That proceeded from the infi-
 “ nite dignity of his person, and not from his sure-
 “ ty engagement.” *Quest.* “ Why then might not
 “ a finite person been surety?” *Ans.* “ Because
 “ he could not have given infinite satisfaction.”

According to this new turn of doctrine, our
 Lord Jesus, as an undertaking Surety, did not en-
 gage to perform an obedience of infinite value ; for
 this only proceeded from the infinite dignity of his
 person, not from his surety-engagement : his obe-
 dience of infinite value was not requisite for our
 redemption ; for it was not undertaken by him in
 his public character and capacity : a satisfaction of
 infinite value was indeed requisite, and so was un-
 dertaken by him, but not an obedience of infinite
 value. Thus, if we should inquire at this teacher,
 Why was it requisite that our Surety-priest should
 be God ? his reply is, p. 102. of his catechism,
 “ That

“ That he might be able to bear infinite wrath, make
 “ his sufferings of infinite value, and his intercession
 “ ever prevalent.” *N. B.* There is not a syllable in
 this answer, that his obedience might be of infinite
 value. Now, reader, how this doctrine will cor-
 respond with the aforementioned catechism, in the
 question and answer quoted, is impossible to under-
 stand, unless we should grant, that both sides of a
 contradiction are true.

Again, in the explicatory catechism, when the
 question is thus stated, *p.* 163. “ Why was it
 “ requisite that the Mediator should be God and
 “ man in one person ?” the answer is thus re-
 turned : “ That the proper works of each nature
 “ might be accepted of God for us, and relied on
 “ by us, as the works of the whole person, Heb.
 “ ix. 14. 1 Pet. ii. 6.” In connection with this
 question and answer, it may be proper to subjoin
 the following, *p.* 252. *Quest.* “ If Christ, as
 “ man, gave obedience to the law for himself, how
 “ can his active obedience be imputed to us ?” *Ans.*
 “ Though the human nature, abstractly consider-
 “ ed, be a creature, yet never subsisting by itself,
 “ but in the person of the Son of God, the acts of
 “ obedience performed therein, were never the
 “ acts of a mere man, but of him who is God-
 “ man, Mediator ; and consequently acts of obe-
 “ dience, not for himself, but for us, Gal. iv.
 “ 4. 5.”

If these judicious answers have any significancy
 and meaning, they fairly decide the point in dis-
 pute. For if Christ's active obedience for us was
 never the obedience of a mere man, but of him who
 was God-man Mediator ; and if it was accepted of
 God for us, as the obedience of the person ; and
 if

if it must be relied on by us as the obedience of the person; then, of necessary consequence, it must be imputed to us in its infinite value, being the obedience of the person that is imputed. Add to all this, and which is very surprising, this very doctrine is taught by this teacher in answer to that question, "Why was it necessary the Saviour should be God and man in one person?" See his Catechism, p. 103. And yet in p. 169. and in his whole *Dissertation*, we are in effect taught, that it is the obedience of a mere man that is imputed to us, not the obedience of the person God-man. Reader, when is it that this doctrine shall become all of a piece? *Ans.* When the inconsistent and self-contradictory doctrine of the idolatrous Catholics shall become harmonious, who teach, that the holy scriptures have a double and contrary sense and meaning. But truth will still be truth, and error will be error, while the world stands, whatever sense and meaning men may put upon certain propositions.

I might also have observed, that he shuffles egregiously in his *Dissertation* with a question in the explicatory catechism, p. 250. But let the question and answer be fully inserted, and I am confident, the impartial reader will find nothing unfavourable in it to the doctrine pled for. *Quest.* 32. "When is it then that, according to truth, "God accepts us as righteous in his sight?" *Ans.* "When Christ's surety-righteousness is actually reckoned ours, and we made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. v. 21. Upon this account "precisely, and no other, we are accepted of God "as righteous; the righteousness of God being upon all them that believe; Rom. iii. 22." The answer

answer is truly satisfying and acceptable, and nothing needs to be added in its defence.

Further, as the late Mr James Hervey is brought into the field, as a favourite of the new doctrine, it cannot certainly be amiss, in justice to Mr Hervey's memory, to rescue him by his own words. The author of the *Dissertation* quotes no particular passage from this illustrious writer; but only refers us in general to his *Theron and Aspasio*, dial. x. letter 3. But as nothing can be found in the dialogue and letter, but what carries the most unfriendly aspect to this author's scheme; so it shall suffice at present, to extract an attestation or two from Theron and Aspasio, which will appear a sufficient barrier against the incroachments of another gospel.

Why, says Theron, vol. 1. dial. 2. p. (*mibi*) 58. "You seem, if not to mutilate, yet to split the merits of Christ, and parcel out the efficacy of his mediatorial undertaking;" ascribing so much "to his active, and so much to his passive righteousness, pardon to this, and life to that."

Aspasio replies after this manner, among other particulars. "Some I believe are pleased with this way of stating the matter." (I might here add, in a parenthesis, an example from the *Dissertation*, p. 16. 2d edit. "Do I mutilate or divide this, in finite righteousness more than the divine law, by its infinitely different demands, doth?" Here is an explicit acknowledgment made by this author, that his doctrine does mutilate Christ's righteousness, though indeed he falsely fathers it upon the holy law). Why, but says Mr Hervey, "this is a method that I neither attempt to defend, nor wish to imitate. To distinguish between the
"active

"active and passive righteousness, I think is not a-
 "miss. But to divide them into detached por-
 "tions, independent of each other, seems to be
 "fanciful rather than judicious." And a little
 "below Mr Hervey adds, "However therefore I may
 "happen to express myself, I never consider them as
 "acting in the exclusive sense, but would always
 "have them understood as a grand and glorious
 "aggregate."

As this passage is remarkably strong and ap-
 "posite, to the author of the Dissertation cannot be
 "greatly nonplussed when he is told, that the mutil-
 "ating doctrine claims his patronage: the dividing
 "of Christ's surety-righteousness into detached por-
 "tions, is a doctrine that bespeaks his friendship.
 "Thus he strongly denies, that Christ's surety-obe-
 "dience is imputed in its infinite value; and as
 "stenuously affirms, that his complete satisfaction is
 "imputed in its infinite value. A finite value, and
 "an infinite value, in an indivisible robe, which is
 "of infinite value, are detached portions with a
 "witness, which the doctrine of Aspasio nauseates.

I might produce another attestation from The-
 "ron and Aspasio, to sum up the evidence against
 "the new hypothesis, *vol. 1. dial. 5. p. 203. 204.*
 "Aspasio having taught, that the believer is inter-
 "ested in Christ's righteousness, and justified by it;
 "Why, "says Theron," be it so; the believer is in-
 "terested in Christ's righteousness. Pray, is he
 "interested in all, or only in part? If in part on-
 "ly, how will you ascertain the degree? What
 "proportion belongs to this person, and what to
 "the other?"

Why, says Aspasio, "The reply to my The-
 "ron's inquiry is easy. Every true believer is in-
 "terested

"interested in all Christ's righteousness in the whole
 "merit of his spotless nature, of his perfect obedi-
 "ence, and expiatory death. Less than the whole
 "would be unavailable; whereas the whole ren-
 "ders us completely justified." To strengthen
 this clear and convincing testimony, I shall, final-
 ly, select from Mr Hervey the following senten-
 ces, *vol. 2. letter 3. p. 318. 319.* "We have
 "all broke the law, we are all unable to keep the
 "law; therefore the blessed Jesus fulfilled the law,
 "fulfilled it in each and every of its demands; ful-
 "filled it in the highest degree of perfection, and,
 "what is of all considerations most delightful, ful-
 "filled it for us, and in our stead, that the merit
 "of his obedience might redound to us, might be
 "placed to our account, and justify us in the sight
 "of God." Such positions as these are such ir-
 refragable documents of Aspasio's judgment as to
 the point in dispute, that it must be needless after-
 wards ever to mention his name as a promoter of
 the opposite scheme.

Upon the whole, I must now tell the author of
 the Dissertation, that, having given the reader a
 sufficient swatch of his abuse of human authorities,
 it is now time for me to supersede any farther in-
 quiry into his numerous quotations; not that I am
 in the least conscious that the rest could not be re-
 scued, as well as the foregoing; but to avoid a
 tiresome prolixity, I chuse to desist.

As to the parade which is made in the close of the
 Dissertation, by the pompous collection of names,
 which has been lately enlarged in the second edition,
 it shall suffice to observe, that the author seems to
 be upon a plot to deafen us with the noise of great
 names, like those at Ephesus, who cried out,

O

for

for two hours together, *Great is Diana of the Ephesians.*

But it is of no great weight to any opinion, who they are that received it. The orthodox doctrine pled for, goes upon a higher authority than what is human. The learning, the piety, the numbers of those who have espoused any tenet, are but a lower reason for us to embrace it; though, in the mean time, it must be accounted a reproach upon these illustrious characters, to give them out as advocates for such a gross notion. It is judiciously observed by Mr Gabriel Wilson, in his excellent sermon, intitled, *The Trust*, preached from 1 Tim. vi. 20. p. 43. That "they (*viz.* gospel-ministers) must banish from their faith and preaching every doctrine, be it ancient or modern, that calls man father. If a doctrine can instruct its pedigree no otherwise than by the subtilty of the schools, the authority of councils, the characters of such god-fathers or adopters, or by its own goodly features and complexion, as being probable, fine, witty, rational, well proportioned, it is but a spurious brood; and therefore not to be owned as any part of the trust. Since it was not transmitted to us from Christ by his apostles, it belongs to the vain bable and bastard science of the text."

And to conclude: Should any, after all, call the doctrine of the imputation of Christ's surety-righteousness in its infinite value, heresy; there is no help for it. As Paul said, respecting another article of the Christian faith, *After the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets.*

I JA 64

F I N I S.